

Volume XVIII.] September, 1841. [Number 4.

RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY:

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, AS SET FORTH IN
THE FORMULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES, AND
WITNESSED FOR BY THE

ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.

EDITED BY C. WEBSTER,

Pastor of the First Associate Congregation, Philadelphia.

VOLUME XVIII.

Then with the Lord, stand ye in the ways, and see, and not in the old paths, where is the good
way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.—Jer. vi. 16.

PHILADELPHIA:

PRINTED BY WILLIAM S. YOUNG.

123, Race Street.

1841-42.

Form: Two sheets, 160 miles, 5 cents; any greater distance, 5 cents.

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

SEPTEMBER, 1841.

A Father's Advice to his Children.

Continued from page 103.

WE are to be denied not only to the pleasures of sin and sense, but even to the observance of religious duties. We are in danger of relying upon these. This is making our own righteousness the ground of our acceptance with God. But all our righteousness is as filthy rags; and "by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." see Luke xvii. 10: Rev. iii. 17, 18.

21. The *difficulties* of the Christian life, our own incapacity, and the many that are overcome, may lead us to say, "Who is sufficient for these things?" But the same apostle who puts this question, says, "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me." Our sufficiency is of God. See Heb. iv. 16: 2 Cor. xii. 9. John xv. 5. We are not required to do any thing in our own strength. He says, "work, for I am with you." See Phil. ii. 12, 13. To work out our salvation is to be diligent in the use of appointed means, and God will give efficacy to his own ordinances. See Exod. xx. 24. Those who neglect these ordinances, neglect the great salvation, and they shall not escape. If salvation be an exceeding great and eternal weight of glory, we surely ought to employ every means of divine appointment for its attainment. Is it a matter to you of no concern whether you be miserable or happy for evermore? You wish to escape the perdition of ungodly men—you wish to die the death of the righteous, and that your latter end may be like his; then to your faith you must add virtue, &c. See 2 Pet. i. 3—11. You cannot gain the prize except you run. You cannot reap in your fields except you cultivate them, and employ every precaution to secure a crop. You are willing to labour and endure fatigue to enjoy a comfortable living; and will you do nothing to enjoy eternal salvation? Though you can neither renew your heart nor believe of yourselves, you can avoid places of criminal resort, ungodly company, worldly words and actions on the Lord's day. You can go to the place of worship, and hear the gospel, you can read the word of God, and other religious books instead of novels and other unprofitable books, to read which is only a waste of valuable time. You can also retire and "pray to your Father, who seeth in secret; and will reward openly." Till you do these and similar duties, you must be considered as doing nothing for the salvation of your souls; and must at last wonder and perish—wonder at your own folly in

standing all the day idle, and neglecting the things that belong to your everlasting peace. The whole of your life is but a short period to prepare for an eternal state of duration. You see others around you entering with deep interest into the affairs of religion, regarding its demands as matters of the very first importance; and you yourselves living in the utmost unconcern; as if the whole were a matter of mere option, that you may attend to or not as your convenience or inclination dictates. The blessing and curse, life and death are set before you, and neglect is at your eternal peril. You will be called upon one day to account for your talents; that is, your opportunities, whether you improve them or not, see Matt. xxv. 14—30. Says one, "I have observed, that dying persons have often mourned their neglect of religion, their apostacy from religion, and their want of religion; but never have I observed a dying Christian lamenting, that he had loved Christ too fervently, or served him too long and exclusively.

22. In connexion with this, it is proper, that I say something in relation to the choice of a profession. To many this is a matter of no importance. To the question, To what religious denomination do you belong? how often is the answer, to *none*: which is the same as to say we are of no religion. It is said of the followers of the Lamb, that they have his Father's name in their foreheads; which is an open profession of his religion, in opposition to all that is of an antichristian and unscriptural character. Almost every one is engaged in some manual employment, whereby he may gain a comfortable living, yet many such can live a long life in the world without any profession of religion, and still cherish the delusive hope that heaven at last shall be their everlasting home. Many now say Lord, Lord, to whom he will say, Depart from me, I never knew you: which denotes they never had a saving or experimental knowledge of him. The foolish virgins, who had lamps without oil, are persons who have merely a profession, without the reality of divine grace. It is this heavenly oil that makes the lamp of a professor shine. Although many live without either profession or religion, this will be no excuse for any who live in the neglect of either. Sincerity is of vital importance in a profession. Let it not be for a name, or form; but for the honour of God, and your own present religious enjoyment, and future happiness. Many are content with a name to live, while dead; with a form of godliness, while they deny its power, and profess to know God while in works they deny him. Profession without consistency of conduct will be of no avail. Though there be many goats among the sheep, and many foolish virgins with the wise, this will be no warrant to make no profession at all, but to live according to the course of this world. See Matt. xxv. 1—13. A very erroneous opinion in regard to a profession obtains, that it is a matter of no importance what the profession be: that it will never be asked in the great day of what profession they were. Is it so that the Lord Jesus, the church's Head, has instituted a system of religion in his word, and enjoined his ministering servants to teach all things whatsoever he has commanded, and yet left mankind to choose whatever profession suits their own inclination, without inquiring whether scriptural or otherwise. With regard to every profession that wants the sanction of

"Thus saith the Lord," he will say, "Who hath required this at your hands?" If it be so, that God will bring every work into judgment, whether it be good, or whether it be evil; is it conceivable, that a religious profession, of all things the most important, shall be entirely overlooked? If we make a profession at all, we mean thereby to answer the great purpose of our creation, to glorify and enjoy God for ever. But can we glorify God, or hope to enjoy him in the observance of a religion at variance with the requirements of his word? We are required to receive, observe, keep pure and entire all such religious worship and ordinances as God has appointed in his word? This can never be done where doctrines and worship are at variance with that word. Instead of observing that word, many teach for doctrines the commandments of men. Parents in recommending to their children the choice of a religious profession, will, it is to be expected, recommend that which they themselves have made. I then recommend to you the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland, as that which I profess and believe in.* The principles of which are contained in the Confession of Faith, and the subordinate standards of that church. Many of the doctrines of that church are held by other respectable denominations of the Presbyterian order. The principles of this church I have taught you: for farther knowledge on these principles you may read the Confession of Faith. The Cloud of Witnesses, Scotts' Worthies, Cruickshank's History of the Church of Scotland; Wylie's Sons of Oil, &c. You have also been taught the doctrine of your fallen and ruined condition in Adam, and of your recovery through the obedience and sufferings of the divine Saviour. You have been taught also to pray, to appreciate God's ordinances, to read and to hear God's word, observe the Sabbath, &c. To these and all other Christian duties you are bound by baptismal engagements. The vows of God are upon you. To neglect any of these duties will increase your condemnation, much above those who were never so taught.—See 2 Pet. ii. 20—22.

23. There is one duty intimately connected with the foregoing, which I cannot omit to recommend, that is to contribute to the support of the gospel. Preachers of the gospel are men, and have families, which must be supported as well as others. This duty is not a matter of mere option that may be done, or not, as we choose. It is an express command of God, that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel. See the following passages. Mat. iii. 8—10; 1 Cor. ix. 9—14; 2 Cor. ix. 5—15; Gal. vi. 6—10. The priests of old, by divine appointment, were to have a tenth of the produce of the land, besides the sacrifices and offerings presented to the Lord. Some fanatics are decidedly opposed to any such contributions, which manifests either their ignorance, or niggardliness. Those who do not contribute to the support of the gospel, evidence that they care nothing for the gospel; and that it is all one to them whether there be any gospel in the country or in the world. There is another class that has a claim upon our substance as well as gospel ministers. I mean the poor. "They that give to the poor, lend to the Lord." There were very strict charges of old to provide for

* The reader will perceive that our author is a Reformed Presbyterian, and will of course make due allowance for any of the *peculiarities* of that denomination, which may appear in his production.—EDIT. REL. MOS.

the poor. The same charges are still obligatory upon us. To support the poor and ministers of religion, is viewed as a matter merely optional, that may or may not be done at pleasure: this is a very flagrant mistake. Their claims are as obligatory upon us as any debt that we contract. As the law does not enforce payment in these cases, the claims of the divine law, and a sense of duty are little regarded. The duty will appear very clear from the following passages. Mal. iii. 3—10; Prov. iii. 9, 10; xix. 17; xxii. 9, and Eccl. xi. 1. There are other laudable institutions for the diffusion of religious knowledge, such as bible, tract, and missionary societies; which certainly have a claim upon our liberality. To support these is certainly a part of our moral and religious duty. See Dick on Covetousness.

24. It is a divine admonition to "be in the fear of the Lord all the day long." "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," and is a noble antidote against the commission of evil; as in the case of Joseph, "How shall I do this great wickedness and sin against God?" This will be the language of every one possessed of godly fear. Where this grace is wanting, vice will be fearlessly indulged. Jos. ii. 19. It is a character of the wicked, that "the fear of God is not before their eyes." This precious grace is the subject of a gracious promise, Jer. xxxii. 40. There are many precious promises to those who are possessed of it. Mal. iv. 2; Psalm xxv. 12—14; ciii. 11, 17; Prov. x. 27; xiv. 27; xvi. 6; and xix. 23.

CONCLUSION.—My only apology for writing you so long a letter is the importance of the subject, and my love to your precious, immortal souls. I hope its length will not deter you from carefully and prayerfully reading it; not once, but frequently, and the passages referred to. Read with the most serious attention; and earnestly pray for grace to perform the duties required. The most important of all Christian duties is that of believing in the Lord Jesus Christ, the alone and all-sufficient Saviour of lost sinners. Without this faith it is impossible to be saved. "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." "He that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." For all who believe not in him, so as to receive and rest upon him alone for salvation, shall die in their sins. I have required nothing of you, but what is required in the word of God; and by that word you shall be judged, whether you regard it or not. Rom. ii. 12, 16; vii. 12, 22. Read attentively the duties required and the sins forbidden in the commandments, in the catechisms, chiefly the larger. If any thing require our serious attention more than another, in the short period of our existence, it is *religion*, as that in which our eternal all is concerned. Yet there is nothing in which men are more superficial and unconcerned. Is it so with you? shall I thus write, and feel the deepest anxiety for you, provide you with the best books and periodicals, and on every occasion warn you to flee from the wrath to come, to consider your latter end, to improve time, and every means of grace, yet will you live in the neglect of all these? Instead of storing your mind with religious knowledge, by reading good books, and attending the ordinances, are you carelessly trifling away precious time, profaning the sabbath in worldly conversation with ungodly companions, and living according to the course of this world, as if you were to live here for ever in the un-

interrupted enjoyment of corporeal good and the pleasures of sense? See Eccles. ii. 9, 10; Ps. lxxiii., and the Book of Job.

The present is the time of God's long-suffering patience towards perishing sinners. When this limited period shall have expired, and the whole number of the elect shall be gathered to glory, then will he be favourable no more, means of grace shall be no longer continued, and calls to repentance no longer tendered. He will then deal with impenitent sinners on the terms of inflexible justice. They will be cast, soul and body, into the lake of fire and brimstone. If, therefore, you would not be miserable for evermore, improve the season of youth, the calls of grace, and the day of your merciful visitation. How pleasant, in the prospect of dissolution, to be able to look back upon a life of religion and piety; which will be a source of joy, but never of sorrow, to any. Paul could say, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me in that day, and not to me only, but to all who love his glorious appearance." Would you wish this to be your happy condition, and be able to employ such triumphant language? then try yourselves by these few following questions.

1. What do you think of Christ? Do you esteem him to be the only up-making portion of the immortal soul, the pearl of great price, and altogether lovely; or is he devoid of excellency in your estimation? for it is only to them that believe that he is precious.

2. What think you of yourselves? Do you believe that you are dead in trespasses and sins, and liable to the curse of a broken law; and that without a saving change, and an interest in Christ, you must be miserable for evermore? 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. iii. 10.

3. Do you believe that the threatenings in the divine word will as certainly be fulfilled in the punishment of the wicked, as the precious promises in rewarding the obedience of them that believe? Do the following, and such passages alarm your fears, as in the case of David and Paul? See Ps. cxix. 120; 2 Cor. v. 10, 11; Rom. i. 18; ii. 1—9; vi. 23; Isa. xxiii. 14; Prov. xxix. 1; Ps. xi. 6; Luke xiii. 1—5, 23—28; xiv. 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 22; 2 Thess. i. 6—11; Heb. vi. 4—8; x. 28—31; 1 Pet. iv. 18. Do you cry, "What shall I do to be saved?" "God be merciful to me a sinner." See Matt. ii. 28; Josh. vi. 37; Luke xv.

4. What do you think of the covenant plan of salvation; do you regard it as the most glorious display of the wisdom, mercy, and love of God to lost sinners, and that all its blessings are offered to you individually through the Mediator? Can you say this is all your salvation, and all your desire?

5. Do you believe that true and vital religion is the one thing needful, as that alone which can secure your eternal felicity; and that its requirements are your indispensable duty? or is religion to you of all things a matter of the most entire indifference, and that its duties you can from day to day entirely neglect?

6. Is it your desire to die the death of the righteous, and that your latter end be like his? But this is impossible without union to Christ, and a conversation becoming the gospel. See Ps. xxxvii. 34—40; Phil. i. 27. If instead of this you live according to the course of this world, you may expect at least the awful malediction,

"Depart from me, ye cursed." Ever remember that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Then pray that the Lord may create in you a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within you, that he would bring you to Christ, that he would pardon all your sins, keep you from evil, guide you by his counsel, and, at last, receive you to the mansions of glory. All which, that the Lord may graciously grant, is the earnest desire of your loving

FATHER.

[From the Watchman of the South.]

Some Facts connected with Infidelity in England.

BEING lately in the company of a person, formerly resident in London, I obtained the following particulars, which I do not recollect to have ever seen in print.

For many years, the Rev. Robert Taylor, a graduate of the University of Dublin, and Richard Carlisle, a bookseller, were diligently engaged in the propagation of Atheism. They denied the existence of any being with such perfections as Christians ascribe to God, and Carlisle exhibited in his shop window a horrid picture, entitled "The God of the Jews and Christians."

Taylor was a man of learning and eloquence, and attracted many hearers. Carlisle was bold, shrewd, and popular. The latter was drawn into a debate by an humble individual, on the subject of *motion*, the ground taken by the opponent of infidelity being that motion is not an attribute of matter, but we see matter every where in motion. How is it moved? Besides, when a body receives an impulse, it has a uniform motion, but we see the motions of the heavenly bodies in their orbits, and the eccentricity of the comets. Thus the existence of something beside matter was shown to be necessary and manifest, and Carlisle, unable to cover his defeat, said, "If you will have a God, make him of gingerbread."

Both Taylor and Carlisle argued vehemently against marriage, as an evil, because it oftentimes bound together, for life, a healthy and a sickly person, and they insisted on what they called "*moral marriages*,"—living together so long as either party chose, and separating at pleasure. Carlisle acted on his principles, and abandoned his wife and children, and took a female under his protection. His desertion of his family deprived him of all claim to respect, and when Taylor quarrelled with him, he advertised a lecture "*on the value of moral character*." This was a blow on his late coadjutor, and not less at his system, for one of the fundamental principles of it was, that man is not responsible for his belief, and that character is the result of circumstances, and, therefore, not a subject of praise or blame.

The lecture is said to have been an able exhibition of the author's powers; he showed by reasoning and by a reference to the past, the importance of moral character to the community. Carlisle was present, and although the subject was treated without any personality, he felt it to be a rebuke to him. Accordingly, he rose on the platform to reply, and after he had gone on for awhile, Taylor rose to leave the house, and as he passed Carlisle, he received a blow behind the ear which covered him with blood. The next day Taylor went before a magistrate to make complaint against Carlisle, but his adversary objected to his oath's being received on the

ground of his being a denier of the Four Evangelists. The magistrate paused, and then said, "Mr. Taylor, do you believe in a future state of rewards and punishments?"—and to the surprise of all, he replied, "*I do*;" thus denying all that for years he had been teaching. Taylor had been living in "*moral marriage*," with a female, but finding among the followers of Robert Owen, the widow of a physician, possessed of wealth, he married her, and forsook her with whom he had lived. Immediately the woman, abetted by Carlisle, prosecuted Taylor, for breach of promise, and judgment was given against him, and he was sentenced to pay a large sum. To avoid doing this, he fled with his wife to France, and is there living on her fortune. He afterwards wrote to the Editor of the *Weekly Despatch*, a Sunday paper in London, of infidel character, that in all his lecturing, he had been influenced by spite, and that his aim was to avenge himself for having been denied preferment in the Church.

Carlisle has since renounced infidelity, and in the presence of a magistrate, and with an oath, has declared his belief in the Holy Scriptures.

K. II.

—♦—
Associate Reformed Synod of New-York.

This ecclesiastical body met in the city of New-York on the 17th of June. We extract from their minutes such items as have a more general bearing upon the interests of religion.

A petition was received from the members of the Fifth A. R. Church in New-York, on the subject of Psalmody. Also two memorials from male and female members of the Fourth A. R. Church, on the subject of slavery. All these papers were laid on the table.

A memorial on Psalmody, from the Elders of the church in Stirling, was received and read, and, on motion, laid on the table.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the practice of our church, in relation to the office of deacon, and report during the present meeting. Messrs. Currie and Moffit were appointed that committee.

The delegates to the Convention of Reformed churches, presented a report, which was accepted and adopted, as follows: The delegates to the Convention of churches report, that they attended the session of said Convention at Philadelphia, in May last, that there was a general representation from the Synods heretofore engaged in this work, and that a committee consisting of Drs. J. T. Pressley and J. McCarrell and Rev. W. Wilson, was appointed to draught a basis of union between those Synods, to be reported at the next meeting of the Convention in May, 1842.

(Signed,)

JOSEPH MCCARRELL,
JNO. FORSYTH, Jun.

Whereupon, Resolved, That this Synod have heard with great pleasure the report of our delegates to the late Convention of orthodox churches, held in Philadelphia in May last, and that we heartily approve of the labours, so far as their report goes.

The committee on improving the version of Psalms reported, and the report was laid on the table.

Rev. D. C. McLaren gave notice of an intention to introduce a motion on the subject of Psalmody.

Resolved, that the subject of slavery be the order of the day for Tuesday morning. An amendment was offered that the subject be post-

poned till next year. The amendment and motion, as amended, were carried. So the subject of slavery was postponed till next year.

Mr. Connelly gave notice of an intention to introduce a motion on the subject of Psalmody.

The subject of Psalmody was called up, and Mr. Connelly, according to notice, seconded by D. C. McLaren, proposed the following preamble and resolutions. Whereas Christian and ministerial intercourse is now practised between this Synod and the General Assembly, Presbyterian and Dutch Reformed churches: Whereas it is desirable that this intercourse should continue without interfering with the internal order or peace of either denomination; and whereas the Psalms used in the aforesaid denominations are not true versions of the Psalms: Therefore, Resolved that the members of the Synod be and they hereby are instructed to use the Psalm Book of our own church, when they officiate in churches of the above named denominations.

Resolved, second, That the members of the Synod may omit singing when called to preach in such circumstances as may render it in their judgment inexpedient or impracticable to use the Psalm Book of our church.

The first resolution was taken under consideration, and after some discussion, Synod adjourned with prayer.

Messrs. Wallace and McCarrell moved the following preamble and resolution, as a substitute for those of Mr. Connelly yesterday, on the subject of Psalmody:

Whereas, The subject of Psalmody has been under the consideration of Synod for several years past, and whereas fears have been entertained in some parts of the church, that the Synod had in contemplation to lay aside a scriptural Psalmody in singing the praise of God in his worship, the Synod consider it their duty to declare, that it neither has been, nor is now, their wish or intention to lay aside the version now in use, in singing the praise of God in his worship. Therefore,

Resolved, first, That the scriptural version of the Book of Psalms now in use among us, be exclusively used in the praise of God in his public and private worship, in all the congregations under the care of Synod.

Resolved, second, That when our ministers preach in other churches, they be, and hereby are directed, to adhere closely to the principle of a scriptural Psalmody, and in no case whatever to sing composesures merely human.

The motion to substitute was carried, and the first resolution was taken under consideration, when Messrs. Currie and Blaikie offered an amendment to include ministers and licentiates. This amendment pending, Dr. McCarrell offered, as an amendment to the amendment, the clause "when officiating in A. R. churches." After some discussion, these two amendments were withdrawn by the movers, and the consideration of them brought again before Synod by Rev. D. C. McLaren, and the amendment of Dr. McCarrell was lost. The amendment of Mr. Currie pending, Synod adjourned with prayer.

Synod proceeded to the discussion of Psalmody, on Mr. Currie's amendment.

After some discussion, it was moved that the whole subject be postponed for the remainder of this meeting.

The committee on Deacons reported, requesting another committee on the subject. The report was recommitted till next meeting.

We shall offer very little comment upon these proceedings; because matters stand in that body the same as heretofore, and because many among us are sanguine of a union with them; at least, this much may be inferred from the almost unanimous vote of our Synod appointing delegates to the

Convention of the Reformed churches; for we are bound to believe that this appointment was in good faith, prompted by an earnest desire to bring these different ecclesiastical bodies together. It is well known that we are altogether opposed to this measure; but as we may be wrong and as an overwhelming majority of Synod think differently, we intend to be a mere looker-on, till we can discern more clearly the design of Providence in these singular movements. In the mean time, we shall communicate facts, leaving the reader to draw conclusions for himself.

Unjust Deposition.

I FIND the following language in a recently published sermon—“We fearlessly maintain in every case of deposition grounded on a relevant charge, there is an entire cessation of office, even though an error in judgment may have been committed in the finding of the judicatory with respect to the proof of the matter or matters charged.”

This sentiment has suggested to my mind the following texts and queries arising from them, taken in their connexion and in connexion with the sentiment itself. Prov. xvii. 15, compared with Acts v. 29; Ex. xx. 16, compared with Matt. xxvi. 60, and Acts vi. 13; Jer. xi. 19—23; xviii. 18; xxxvii. 15; Col. iii. 18. See also question vi. of the Formula of Questions to be put to ministers and elders, at their ordination, “remembering that while they act *uprightly*,” &c.

I had always supposed it was the doctrine of the Protestant world, that decisions of church courts can never receive the sanction of the Lord Jesus Christ which are not agreeable to his will. I, therefore, beg leave respectfully to put the following queries for the consideration of those who advocate this doctrine.

1. If unjust judgment be an abomination to the Lord, does he require his people to submit voluntarily to an abomination?
2. Can honest error in judgment make that judgment valid?
3. Can a conviction upon a relevant charge, established by perjury, make the judgment of the court binding?
4. If this doctrine be true, all that the enemies of a faithful minister have to do, is, not to charge him for preaching the truth, which is the real cause of their offence, but with some immorality, and suborn false witnesses to substantiate their *relevant* charge, as they did against Jeremiah and our Lord himself; and thus they stop the mouth of the Lord's witnesses. For such is the malicious spirit of apostates, that they are not stumbled by the sin of perjury. If they will take the life when opportunity offers, they will also swear away the character.

Finally. It is admitted that it might be *expedient* to desist from the exercise of the ministry, in such a case, or it might not. I am afraid there is in this age a spirit of insubordination on the one hand, and unwarrantable pretension on the other. The apostle rejoiced that the gospel was preached even through personal envy toward himself. See Luke ix. 49, 50, 54, 55. The insertion of the foregoing will oblige,

One in search of Truth.

Ecclesiastical Affairs of Scotland.

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.—The *Edinburgh Advertiser* says that the deputation from the minority of the General Assembly, which had an interview with Lord Melbourne last week, were received with great courtesy; adding, that “his lordship having been informed that the church of one of the deposed clergymen (Mortlach) was in the gift of the Crown, the question was put, ‘whether his lordship would consider that church vacant in consequence of the recent sentence of the Assembly?’ His answer was, ‘Certainly not.’”

Last week, an interdict was issued at the instance of the Earl of Kinross and Mr. Young against the Presbytery of Auchterader and others, in consequence of a direction given by the General Assembly to the Presbytery to proceed to the settlement of a minister in the pastoral charge of the parish of Auchterader, and to obey a special commission appointed by the Assembly.

Meetings have been held to express sympathy with the seven deposed ministers of Strathbogie, in Banff and Aberdeen. In Strathbogie itself, several of the gentry in the neighbourhood, and moderate churchmen from a distance, are eager to manifest their support of the ministers by attending in their churches or assisting in their pulpits.

THE NON-INTRUSIONISTS AND SIR ROBERT PEEL.—We have just learnt on what we consider good authority, that the hon. baronet stated, in the most decided terms, that he would do nothing for the church until they first obeyed the law, and rescinded all their illegal proceedings regarding the enactment of the veto regulations, and the deposition of the Strathbogie ministers. Mr. Donlop answered, the parliament might do whatever they pleased with their endowments, but that the Church would never retrace their steps, whatever might be the consequences; and thus the interview terminated.—*Scottish Pilot*.

PRESBYTERY OF GLASGOW.—A committee of the Presbytery of Glasgow appointed to examine into the allegation that the Rev. Patrick Brewster had preached in a Chartist Church on the 18th of April, have reported in the affirmative: pronouncing his conduct “highly censurable in any minister of the gospel, involving a gross violation of ecclesiastical order, a contempt of decency, a profanation of the Lord’s day, a desecration of the office of the Christian ministry, and a mischievous encouragement to disorganization and misrule both in the Church and State;” and therefore they deemed it their duty to recommend the Presbytery to report it to the Presbytery of Paisley, in order that they might deal with Mr. Brewster as they should think fit, according to the rules of the Church.

UNITED SECESSION SYNOD.—The United Secession Synod, after being engaged for three days in discussing Dr. Walker of Comrie’s case, passed the following resolution on the motion of Mr. Beattie, by a majority of ninety-eight to forty-three: “The Synod approve of the diligence and fidelity of the Presbytery of Perth, find, that Mr. Walker has used language, on the subject of the atonement, election, the imputation of Adam’s sin and man’s inability, and given his sentiments in seeming inconsistency with the doctrines of our subordinate standards, exhort him to be more careful in the language which he employs; but from the explanations Mr. Walker has made, and the disposition he has displayed, appoint a committee to deal with him, with a view to obtain further satisfaction, and to report to-morrow.” The Committee appointed by the Synod to confer with Mr. Morrison, reported that he had attended their first meeting, and expressed his resolution to continue preaching the doctrines for which he had been suspended by the Presbytery; that at their next meeting Mr. Morrison did not attend, but that he had addressed a

letter to the chairman, stating that he did not consider it necessary to hold any further communications on the subject. The Committee therefore unanimously recommend that Mr. Morrison should be declared out of connexion with the Associate Synod. The Synod accordingly declared Mr. Morrison to be no longer in connexion with the United Secession Church, and discharged him from preaching in any of the pulpits of the church, and discharged all ministers and probationers of the body from preaching in the pulpit of Mr. Morrison. In regard to Mr. Walker, of Comrie, the committee professed themselves so much satisfied with their conference with him, that they joined in recommending the Synod to proceed no further against him.

Cheever's Letters from Spain.

Roman Catholic Credulity.—A Feather from the Wing of Gabriel.—The Virgin Mary in a Grog-shop.—The Schools and the Paintings.

OUR friend B., the intelligent Spanish editor, who accompanied us in most of our visits of curiosity in Cadiz, had just translated into Spanish, in a little book which he expected to sell at a great profit, the pretended discoveries of Herschel in the moon. He could not be persuaded that it was a hoax, and made me promise to inquire more particularly in regard to it when I should arrive in London, and to write him on the subject. I told him that if an image of the Virgin had been found in the moon, or if its inhabitants had been seen in a procession, or at the mass, or worshipping St. Anthony, or something of that sort, it would go off in Spain with infinitely more spirit. Not being able to undeceive him, I took the liberty of suggesting in my letter that he should add a note to the book stating that, from records recently discovered by Herschel in one of the lunar temples, and deciphered by aid of a lens of such power as to make the chirography of the lunar inhabitants perfectly legible, they are proved to have been under the government of his holiness the Pope, and that a building has been discovered in a principal street, entitled *Palacio de la inquisition*. It would not be difficult to make a genuine Roman Catholic believe, that St. Peter made a will on his death-bed, conveying to the Pope any number of the planets.

When Mr. Beckford visited the Escorial, he was shown a feather from the wing of the Archangel Gabriel, "full three feet long, and of a flashing hue, more soft and delicate than that of the loveliest rose," the most glorious specimen of plumage ever beheld in terrestrial regions. This magnificent feather was dropped out of Gabriel's wing the night when the multitude of the heavenly host were hovering over the shepherds, watching their flocks; but Mr. Beckford repressed all indiscreet curiosity on the subject, and the monks knelt in silence before this Archangelic manifestation, and rose up again after the feather had been deposited upon its quilted silken mattress in its perfumed cabinet.

When I come to speak of our visit to Grenada and the Alhambra, and also to Lisbon and Cintra in Portugal, I shall have occasion to notice some manifestations of a credulity almost equal to this, though so far in the wane of Roman Catholic superstitions. There was nothing quite so famous in Cadiz, but we visited the old Cathedral for the purpose of seeing its rare collection of relics. They are kept

in a little chapel behind the sacristy, together with the rich and splendid golden and jewelled vessels of the church. Three large cases of relics occupied the side of the chapel, filled with skulls and bones of saints almost innumerable. These are the ordinary Roman Catholic museums of science and art, and sometimes of prodigious extent and variety. In the central casement a piece of the wood of the cross of Christ was shown to us, and one of the thorns from the crown that pierced his head. The golden and jewelled diadems in which these were enclosed were very rich, and the whole casement sparkled with similar exhibitions.

In a genuine Roman Catholic city there are scarcely any concatenations too strange to be met with. Passing by a shop of liquors, my attention was arrested by a shrine of the Virgin Mary, containing her image gaily dressed in a robe of spangled white satin, amidst a crowd of bottles arranged in rows upon the shelves. "Look at this spectacle," said I to my companion; "what a ridiculous figure! The Virgin Mary in a grog shop! They make her the patron saint of all iniquity." "The very place," returned he, "of all others, where, in consistency with their religion, they should station her, as being the one where they most need the absolution of their sins, and the indulgence to commit them." We walked on, impressed with a sense of the great obstacles that lie in the way of the conversion of this people; so deeply, darkly, degraded, broken down, as it were, in the very stamina of their national character, by the paralyzing, belittling, enervating influence of their religious rites and superstitions.

We saw several schools returning home in troops under the care of their masters. It is a singular custom, useful enough in some respects, although a tax imposed on the teacher, and a fetter on the freedom of the child. The teacher goes round from house to house in the morning, calling together his pupils, who start into the street the moment they hear the call of their instructor, and proceed with him to the door of the next urchin, the flock all the way increasing, till he arrives with his full complement at the school. In the same careful manner he carries them home at night, distributing and dropping them along on the way; and I have been highly amused to watch the bootless efforts of the pedagogue endeavouring to keep them in marching order, and to restrain the irrepressible elation and mercurial volatile movements of the wild young creatures just let out from school. The little urchins thought it quite enough to be under his rule within the walls, instead of having him to keep guard over their out-of-door movements.

We visited the Academy of Design to look at its paintings, which are very fine. There are several by Zurbaran, in his peculiar style, which deserve especial notice. But the finest collection is that of a private gentleman, Don Martinez, who possesses a number of paintings by the old masters: several Murillos, a Leonardo da Vinci, two scenes by Salvator Rosa, a Carlo Maratti, a portrait by Titian, works of Espagnoletto, some exquisite Flemish paintings, several by Zurbaran, and some of Lucas Giordano, Juan de Valdez, and Alphonso Cano. I have seldom visited a better private collection.

Yours truly, G. B. C.

N. Y. Observer.

The Cause of God and Truth.

2. Nor should this be concluded from the encouragement that Wisdom gives, to "turn" to her "reproof;" saying, "Behold, I will pour out my Spirit unto you;" since this is not to be understood of the Holy Ghost, and of the dispensation of his extraordinary gifts or of saving grace; for when he is promised in either of these senses it is expressed by a different phrase than what is here used; he is promised to be "poured out upon," and not as here, "unto" the sons of men; see Isa. xlv. 3; Ezek. xxxix. 29; Joel ii. 28. I observe that Dr. Whitby, whenever he cites the passage before us, inadvertently transcribes it as though it was read,* "I will pour out my Spirit upon you," when it is "unto you." By the "Spirit," we are to understand the mind of Wisdom; so the word רוח is used in Prov. xxix. 11; and by "pouring" it "out" a large and full revelation of it to the sons of men, as it is explained in the next clause, "I will make known my words unto you."

3. This external revelation of the mind of Christ, ought not to be called sufficient grace; it is indeed the means of conveying and implanting grace, when it comes not in word only, but with the Holy Ghost and with power: it is not sufficient means of grace to all men; for all men have it not, nor is it so to all that have it; for to some it is the "savour of death unto death," whilst it is to others the "savour of life unto life;" nor is it of itself sufficient means to any, without the efficacious grace of God. Hence,

4. Though the calls, invitations, and messages of God to men, by his ministers, may be sometimes (for they are not always) sufficient inducements to procure an external reformation, an outward repentance, as in the people of Nineveh; yet these are not sufficient of themselves, without powerful grace, to produce true faith in Christ, evangelical repentance towards God, and new spiritual obedience in life and conversation.

IV. These words, "I have called, and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded," are used† to prove the resistibility of the grace of God, and that an irresistible power is not necessary to the conversion of a sinner. But,

1. It ought to be observed, that there is a twofold call; the one is internal, which is by the powerful operations of the Spirit of God on the soul, either with or without the word; which cannot be so resisted, as to be made to cease, to become void, and of no effect; the other is external, by the ministry of the word; and may be resisted, rejected, and despised, and become useless: now it is of the latter call, and not of the former, that the text speaks, and therefore no ways militates against the irresistible, unfrustrable grace of God in conversion: and in this sense are we to understand some other places of Scripture, as Prov. ii. 3, 4; and xi. 3, 4; Isa. lxxv. 2: Matt. xx. 16.

2. It is said,‡ that "were such an irresistible power necessary to the conversion of a sinner, no man could be converted sooner than he is; because before this irresistible action came upon him, he could not be converted; and when it came upon him, he could not choose but be converted." To which I reply, I see no absurdity in the con-

* Whitby, p. 181, 251; ed. 2. 177, 245. † Remonstr. in Coll. Hag. art. iii. iv. p. 215.

‡ Ibid. art. iii. iv. p. 221; Whitby, p. 260; ed. 2. 254.

sequence; for, as all our times are in the hands of God, a time to be born, and a time to die; so likewise the time of conversion, which is called a time of love, Ezek. xvi. 8. Now as a man cannot be born sooner or later than he is, nor die sooner or later than he does; so neither can he be converted sooner or later than he is. But then,

3. It is objected,* that if this be the case, "no man could reasonably be blamed that he lived so long in his impenitent and unconverted state." To which I answer, that living in an impenitent and unconverted state, is living in sin, and therefore blameworthy. And though man, by sinning, has involved himself in a state, out of which he cannot extricate himself; yet is he not the less culpable on that score for living in it.

4. It is further objected,† that if man cannot be converted sooner than he is, God must unreasonably make these inquiries, "How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity?" with others, in the following places, Exod. xiv. 28; Numb. xiv. 11; Jer. iv. 14, and xiii. 27. In answer to which, it will be enough to say, that these passages speak not of conversion, but of external obedience and reformation; which might be sooner done, though conversion cannot.

5. It is said,‡ that if it is so, "it would not be praiseworthy in persons that they were then converted, it being not in their power then to be otherwise; since an unfrustrable operation is that which no man can frustrate." It is very true; for all the praise of conversion is due to the powerful and efficacious grace of God, and none to the power and will of man.

6. It is asked,§ "If there be some physical and unfrustrable operation on God's part, necessary to the new birth, why is the want of this new birth and spiritual renovation imputed to men's voluntary want of consideration, to their "rejecting the counsel of God," and "not choosing the fear of the Lord?" Prov. i. 24, 25, 29, 30. I reply; That the want of the new birth and spiritual renovation, is not the thing spoken of in the place referred to; but a non-attention to, and a contempt of, the ministry of the word, though these indeed are a sign of it; much less is this imputed to men's rejecting the counsel of God, and not choosing the fear of the Lord; for the tables must be turned; and if we speak truth, we must say, that man's rejecting the counsel of God, and not choosing the fear of the Lord, are owing, and to be imputed, to a want of the new birth and spiritual renovation. Besides, as the new birth and spiritual renovation are the effects of, and owing to the Spirit and grace of God, and therefore called a being "born of water and of the Spirit," and "the renewing of the Holy Ghost;" so a want thereof is owing to a man's not having that grace which is in the power of God only to bestow upon him.

SECTION XI.

Wash ye, make you clean, &c.—ISA. i. 16, 17.

THESE words are supposed to express the power of man, and contradict the necessity of unfrustrable grace in conversion; the argument from them is formed in this manner:|| "If conversion be wrought only by the unfrustrable operation of God, and man is purely passive in it, vain are all these commands and exhortations

* Whitby, p. 260; ed. 2. 254.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. p. 261; ed. 2. 255.

§ Ibid. p. 224, 257, ed. 2. 218, 251.

|| Ibid. p. 237; ed. 2. 231.

directed to wicked men." The weakness of which conclusion will appear by considering particularly each command or exhortation.

1. "Wash ye, make you clean;" these two are to be regarded as one, since they intend one and the same thing; and suppose, that men, in a state of nature, are polluted and unclean; and indeed their pollution is of such sort, and to such a degree, that they cannot cleanse themselves, either by ceremonial ablutions, or moral services, or evangelical ordinances; for, "who can say, I have made my heart clean; I am pure from my sin?"* This is God's work only, as appears from his promises to cleanse his people from their sins; from the end of Christ's shedding his blood, and the efficacy of it; from the sanctifying influences of the Spirit; and from the prayers of the saints† to God, that he would "create" in them "clean hearts, wash them thoroughly from," their "iniquity," and "cleanse" them "from" their "sin." But if this be the case, that it is God's work alone, and that man is incapable to cleanse himself from sin, it will be said, to what purpose are such exhortations? I answer; to convince men of their pollution, and that they stand in need of being washed and cleansed, of which they are naturally ignorant: there are too many who are "pure in their own eyes, and yet not washed from their filthiness:"‡ as also, to bring them to a sense of their own inability to cleanse themselves; which seems to be the particular design of them here; since these Jews thought to have washed themselves from their immoralities by their ceremonial services, and which are therefore rejected by God, ver. 11—15; and they, notwithstanding all their legal purifications, are called upon to wash and make clean: besides, such exhortations may be useful to lead persons to inquire after the proper means of cleansing, and so to the fountain of Christ's blood, in which only souls being washed are made clean. These exhortations then are not in vain; though conversion is wrought only by the unfrustrable operation of God, and man is purely passive in it. This view of them will help us to understand aright some parallel places; such as Jer. iv. 14, xiii. 27; 2 Cor. vii. 1; James i. 21, and iv. 8, which commonly go in company with these.

2. "Put away the evil of your doing from before mine eyes." Evil is said to be put away from a nation, when it is punished in the doer of it; see Deut. xiii. 5, and xvii. 7, 12; and from a family and particular persons, when discouraged and abstained from, Job xi. 14, and xxii. 23. But it ought to be observed, that the exhortation here is not barely to put away their doings, but the evil of them; and that not from themselves, but from before the eyes of God. Now to put away sin in this sense, is to take it away, to remove it, as that it is pardoned, and men acquitted and discharged from it; but this is impracticable to men, and is the act of God only; as is evident from his promises to remove the sins of his people; from the end of Christ's sacrifice, which was to put away sin for ever; and from the prayers of the saints, who desire that God would "take away all iniquity, and receive graciously." But why then is such an exhortation given? First, to convince men that the putting away of sin from the eyes God's vindictive justice, is absolutely necessary to salvation; and then that men cannot by all their

* Prov. xx. 9.

† Psalm li. 2, 7, 10.

‡ Prov. xxx. 12.

ceremonial and moral services do this; for "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin;"* as also to lead and direct their views to the sacrifice of Christ which effectually does it; and without which, "to what purpose is the multitude of sacrifices?" and vain are all "oblations," ver. 11, 12.

3. "Cease to do evil:" which regards either a cessation from ceremonial works, which being done with a wicked mind, were an abomination to the Lord, ver. 13, 14, or an abstinence from outward immoralities; such as shedding innocent blood, oppressing the fatherless and widow, ver. 15, 17. Now a natural man may be able to abstain from such external enormities of life, without supposing a power in him to do that which is spiritually good; or that the unfrustrable grace of God is unnecessary in conversion.

4. "Learn to do well; that is, to do acts of justice, beneficence, liberality, and charity, such as are here mentioned; "seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow;" all which are very commendable, and may be performed by men in an unconverted state; and no way militate either against man's passiveness, or the necessity of God's efficacious grace in the work of conversion.

SECTION XII.

Come now and let us reason together: If ye be willing and obedient, &c.
—ISA. i. 18, 19.

I. THE eighteenth verse is considered in strict connexion with the words preceding and following; from whence it is concluded, that to "cease to do evil," and "learn to do well," to "be willing and obedient,"† are qualifications for the pardoning mercy of God, and conditions of obtaining it; the promises of pardon, life, and salvation, being made to persons of such characters. But,

1. Let it be observed, that the eighteenth verse may be read in a parenthesis, without any connexion with or dependence on either the preceding or subsequent verses; being thrown in on purpose to comfort the people of God, oppressed with a sense of their sins, whilst he is expressing his just resentment and indignation against the sins of others.

2. Admitting it to be in strict connexion with the context, it contains a free declaration of pardoning grace and mercy, without any conditions annexed to it; it is not expressed in a conditional form; it is not said, if ye "cease to do evil," and "learn to do well," then "though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow;" nor is it said, "if ye be willing and obedient," then "though your sins be red like crimson, they shall be as wool," but "ye shall eat the good of the land."

3. God's promise of pardon is free, absolute, and unconditional; it is expressed in this manner: "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities I will remember no more:"‡ and made to persons guilty both of sins of omission and commission; who had "bought" him "no sweet cane with money; neither" had "filled" him "with the fat of sacrifices;" but had "made" him "to

* Heb. x. 4. † Whitby, p. 181, 242, 298; ed. 2, 177, 236, 291. ‡ Heb. viii. 12.

serve with" their "sins," and had "wearied him "with" their "iniquities."*

4. Pardon of sin is never ascribed to any condition performed by men, but to the free grace of God, streaming through the blood of Christ; which was shed to obtain it, and in whose gift it is, being "exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance unto Israel, and forgiveness of sins;"† and which is often given to persons without any conditions previously qualifying them for it.

5. Obedience is not the condition of pardon, though a declaration of pardon is an excellent motive to induce to obedience; evangelical obedience springs from, and is influenced by discoveries of pardon, but is neither the cause nor condition of it.

II. It is here promised to such who are "willing and obedient," that they "shall eat the good of the land;" and threatened to the disobedient, that they "shall be devoured with the sword:" from whence it does not follow, that it is in the power of man to do what is spiritually good, much less that eternal happiness depends upon, or is to be obtained by man's obedience. For,

1. The voluntary obedience here encouraged, is to things civil; such as to "relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, and plead for the widow," ver. 17, which it is allowed are in the power of a natural man to perform; and might be reasonably expected from a professing people, as those were to whom these exhortations were given.

2. What is here promised, is not of a spiritual or eternal, but of a temporal nature; "ye shall eat the good of the land;" that is, of the land of Canaan: the possession of which they held by their obedience to those laws of a moral, civil, and ceremonial kind, which God gave them as a body politic; and which, so long as they observed they were continued in the quiet and full enjoyment of all the blessings of the good land, flowing with milk and honey, as were promised to them; See Deut. v. 32, 33, and vi. 24, 25, and xxviii.—14; Lev. xxvi. 3—10. But when they refused and rebelled, it was otherwise with them. And therefore,

3. The punishment threatened to their disobedience and rebellion is temporal; "ye shall be devoured with the sword, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it;" as he had in Lev. xxvi. 25, 33; and so it was frequently with this people, when they broke the laws of God, transgressed his commands, and rebelled against him, the enemy was let in upon them, the sword was drawn against them, and they destroyed by it, or carried captive.

SECTION XIII.

"What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? Wherefore when I looked, &c.—ISA. v. 4.

No one place of Scripture is more frequent in the mouths and writings of the patrons of free will,‡ and adversaries of the grace of God, than this; which is used by them to prove that God gives sufficient grace for the conversion of such who are not converted;

* Remonstr. in Coll. Hag. art. iii. iv. p. 216, 219; Act. Synod. p. 89, &c; Curcell Christ. Institut. l. 6, c. 13, sec. 3, p. 400; Limborch. l. 4, c. 13, sect. 2, 3, 4, p. 369

† Isa. xliiii. 24, 25.

‡ Acts v. 31

and that he does not effect that work by an irresistible power, by an unfrustrable operation; which operation, it is said, "if necessary to produce the expected fruits, and not vouchsafed, it must follow, that this vineyard had not grace sufficient to answer her Lord's expectations; and if so, he must unreasonably complain, that she brought forth wild grapes, and more unreasonably expect good grapes, and most unreasonably punish her for not doing what he would not give her grace sufficient to perform."* To which I reply,

1. These words are part of a parable, representing the state and condition of the people of the Jews. Now, parabolical divinity is not argumentative; nor ought parables to be stretched beyond their scope and design: the intent of this is to show the ingratitude of the Jews, in the midst of many favours bestowed on them, and the patience and long-suffering of God towards them, and to vindicate his justice in their ruin as a nation.

2. Seeing there is a particular application of this parable to the people of Israel and Judah, ver. 7; "The vineyard of the Lord of Hosts is the House of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plants;" who were favoured with peculiar blessings above all people on the face of the earth; it can be no proof of any blessing or grace common to all mankind; or in other words, it can be no proof that God gives to all men sufficient grace for conversion, though not effectual, through their perverseness.

3. It does not appear from hence that God gave to all the men of Israel and Judah, grace sufficient for conversion; which is not a national, but a personal blessing; and it is evident, that some among them had not restraining grace, no sense of sin in them, nor fear of God before their eyes; they "drew iniquity with cords of vanity, and sin as it were with a cart-rope;" they said, "Let him make speed, and hasten his work, that we may see it; and let the counsel of the holy one of Israel draw nigh and come, that we may know it: they called evil good, and good evil; put darkness for light, and light for darkness," ver. 18—20. Nor was every man in Israel and Judah capable of judging whether God had given sufficient grace or not, to any, or all among them.

4. These words, "What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" cannot be understood of God's having done all that was sufficient and necessary to the saving conversion of those who are designed by the vineyard; for a reply to the question, taken in this sense, might easily be made after this manner: that God could have made of this bad vine a good one, which was absolutely necessary to its bringing forth good grapes; he could by internal grace have effected the saving work of conversion; to which external means, without it, were insufficient; he could have removed the veil from their understandings, and have taken away the stony heart, and given a heart of flesh; all which are requisite to the real work of conversion.

5. The similitudes in the parable only regard the external culture of the vineyard, and can only, at most, design the outward means of reformation, which these people enjoyed; such as the mission of the Lord's prophets to them, the ministry of the word, admonitions,

* Whitby, p. 234; ed. 2. 229.

exhortations, reproofs, &c. when it might be expected that a people enjoying such privileges, would behave well in their moral conversation; and instead of being guilty of rapine, oppression, luxury, drunkenness, pride, and contempt of God himself, sins which they are in this chapter charged with; they would have done common justice between man and man, would have sought judgment, relieved the oppressed, judged the fatherless, and pleaded for the widow: all which they might have done, without supposing them to have grace sufficient to saving conversion, and though this might be withheld from them; and therefore it was not unreasonable in the Lord to expect good grapes of this kind from them, nor to complain of their wild grapes, nor to punish them for them.

6. If the parable is narrowly examined, it will be found that the good things which God had done for his vineyard, the men of Israel and Judah, were of a civil nature, and which regarded their civil constitution and settlement as a body politic; such as the planting of it "in a very fruitful hill," in the land of Canaan, a land flowing with milk and honey; "fencing" it with good and wholesome laws, which distinguished and kept them separate from other nations, as well as with his almighty power and providence; especially at the three yearly festivals, when all their males appeared at Jerusalem: "gathering out the stones," casting the heathen out, and driving the Canaanites before them; "planting it with the choicest vine," such having fallen in the wilderness who murmured and rebelled against God; "building a tower in it," expressive of divine protection: and placing "a wine-press," which may either mean plenty of temporal blessings, or the prophets, who were placed among them to stir up and exhort the people to a regard to the laws of God.

7. God's "looking" or "expecting" that this vineyard should bring forth grapes is not to be taken properly but figuratively, after the manner of men; for, from such a well formed government, from such an excellent constitution, from a people enjoying such advantages, might it not be reasonably expected that the fruits of common justice and equity would have appeared? might not "judgment" have been "looked" for instead of "oppression," and "righteousness" instead of a "cry?" but alas! it proved just the reverse.

8. The interrogation ought not to be rendered as it is by our translators, "What could have been done more to my vineyard?" &c., nor, as Dr. Whitby reads it, "What was there more to do for my vineyard?" &c., but מה לעשות עוד לכרמי, should be translated, "What is to be done hereafter to my vineyard?" &c., and so designs not any thing past, but something to come; and is to be understood not of good things bestowed before, but of punishment hereafter to be inflicted, as evidently appears from the answer to it, ver. 5, 6:—"And now go to, I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard; I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up, and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down, and I will lay it waste," &c., which was fulfilled in the destruction of the land by the Chaldeans, a punishment God never inflicted to that degree before on that people; and so the words have much the same meaning with those in Matt. xxi. 40, 41:—"When the Lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto these husbandmen? they say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and let out his vineyard to other husbandmen, which

shall render him the fruits in their seasons;" for the question must be of the same nature with the answer; and if it be so, the words are far enough from proving that grace sufficient for conversion is given to some who are not converted, or from contradicting the doctrine of unfrustrable grace in conversion.

SECTION XIV.

For thus saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel; In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength; and ye would not.—ISA. xxx. 15.

THESE words are cited* in favour of free will, as proving that men's impotency to that which is good, is not owing to any disability by the fall of Adam, but to other causes acquired by, and not born with them; such as evil dispositions, customs, prejudices, hardness of heart, or blindness wilfully contracted; and therefore irresistible and unfrustrable grace is not necessary to the conversion of a sinner; but of what service they are in this cause will be better understood when the following things are observed.

1. Admitting that the words regard the spiritual and eternal salvation of men, then they are expressive of the way and manner in which God saves such who are saved. "In returning and rest shall ye be saved," that is by faith and repentance; repentance may be meant by, "returning," and faith by "rest;" or by "returning and rest," may be designed returning to rest, that is, to Christ, who is the only rest to weary souls; "in quietness and confidence shall be your strength." "Quietness" may intend peace of conscience, and "confidence" assurance of faith, which make men strong Christians, though their strength does not barely lie in these graces, but in the object of them. Now faith and repentance are blessings of the covenant, gifts of God; the graces of the Spirit go together in the doctrine of salvation, and have a great concern in it; though they are not meritorious, procuring causes, nor conditions of it, yet in this way God brings his people to salvation; they enter into and are descriptive of the character of such that are saved; there is so close a connexion between these and salvation; that none are saved without them.

2. If we take this to be the sense of the words, then the last clause, "and ye would not," shows, that God's way of saving men through repentance and faith, by going to Christ alone for rest, by placing all confidence in, and deriving all peace and comfort from him, is disagreeable to unregenerate men; which is a proof of the wretched depravity, corruption, and perverseness of the will. Hence this scripture, viewed in this light, with Jer. vi. 16, 17, and xiii. 11, 27, and xviii. 12, and xxix. 19, Ezek. xx. 8, Hos. v. 4, stand on record, as so many lasting reproaches to the will of man.

3. Let this depravity, corruption, perverseness, and obstinacy of the will proceed from what cause soever, whether from any thing born with men, or acquired by them; such as evil dispositions, customs, prejudices, hardness and blindness of heart; what else can conquer these evil dispositions, break such customs, destroy such prejudices, and remove this blindness and hardness of heart, but the almighty power and efficacious grace of God? How necessary there-

* Whitby, pp. 261, 262; ed. 2. 255.

fore are the irresistible and unfrustrable operations of the Spirit of God to the conversion of such sinners; when can it be reasonably expected they should be "willing" to be saved by Jehovah in his own way, but "in the day of" his "power" on their souls? who must "work in" them both "to will and to do" of his "good pleasure," if ever the perverseness of their wills is cured. But,

4. Though, no doubt, the depravity and stubbornness of the will is increased by prejudices, customs, &c., yet to what can its first taint be ascribed, or from whence had it its first blow, and received its original disability, but from the fall of Adam? Does not the Scripture, according to this doctrine, furnish us with the best account of the origin of moral evil? Does not the apostle* attribute men's conversation in "the lusts of the flesh," their "fulfilling," *ταβέληματα της σαρκος* "the wills of the flesh, and of the mind," to their being "by nature children of wrath?" Why is it "the wicked will not hearken to the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely," but because they are "estranged from the womb, they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies?"† And what else can be the source and spring of such early practices in iniquity, but the corruption of nature, owing to the fall of man, they bring into the world with them? Do we not read‡ of some whose "neck" was "an iron sinew," and their "brow brass;" whose obstinacy, disobedience, and treacherous dealing, are accounted for by their being "called transgressors from the womb?"

5. After all, the words are not to be understood of the spiritual and eternal salvation of men, but of the temporal safety and happiness of the people of Israel, had they acted according to the advice given them; "in returning and rest shall ye be saved;" that is, if ye return from the evil "counsel" which ye have taken, which is "not of me," saith the Lord, ver. 1, and rest quietly in your own land, and do not "walk to go down into Egypt," nor seek to Pharaoh for help, ver. 2, 3, "ye shall be saved;" you shall be in safety, no enemy shall break in upon you, or disturb you; "in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength;" your "strength is to sit still," ver. 7, quietly to abide in Jerusalem, in your own cities, and trust in my power and protection, then ye need not fear any enemy; "and ye would not; but ye said," for we will flee *על סוסים*, "unto horses," to Egypt for horses, or "upon horses," which we have had from thence; "therefore shall ye flee: we will ride upon the swift, therefore they that pursue you shall be swift," meaning the Chaldeans; one thousand shall flee "at the rebuke of one, at the rebuke of five shall ye flee, till ye be left as a beacon upon the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on a hill." Now as this appears from the context to be the plain and genuine sense of the words, they can be of no use to prove what they are cited for, and ought to have no place in the controversy about free-will, and efficacious grace.

SECTION XV.

Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat, yea, come buy wine and milk without money and without price.—ISA. lv. 1.

1. THESE words are no call, invitation, or offer of grace to dead sinners, since they are spoken to such who were "thirsty," that

* Eph. ii. 8. † Psalm lviii. 3, 5. ‡ Isa. xlviii. 4, 8. § Whitby, p. 341; ed. 2. 358.

is, who, in a spiritual sense, were thirsting after pardon of sin, a justifying righteousness, and salvation by Christ; after a greater knowledge of him, communion with him, conformity to him, and enjoyment of him in his ordinances, which supposes them to be spiritually alive; for such who are dead in sin, thirst not after the grace of God, but the lusts of the flesh; they mind and savour the things of the flesh, and not the things of the Spirit; only new-born babes, or such who are born again, are quickened and made alive, desire Christ, his grace, and "the sincere milk of the word," that their souls may grow thereby; besides, the persons called unto, are represented as having "no money;" which, though true of unconverted persons, who have nothing to pay off their debts, or purchase any thing for themselves; yet they fancy themselves to be "rich," and "increased in goods," and, "stand in need of nothing;" whereas the persons here encouraged are such, who not only have no money, but know they have none; who are "poor in spirit," and sensible of their spiritual poverty; which sense arises from the quickening influences of the Spirit of God upon their souls; nor are Isa. i. 18, 19, Luke xiii. 3, John iii. 16, and viii. 24, any offers of grace, as they are with this represented to be.

2. They do not express any power or ability in unconverted persons to come to Christ, seeing they are not directed to such, as is before observed; besides, neither Christ, nor the grace of Christ, are designed by "the waters," but the ordinances; the allusion being, as is thought by some,* to maritime places, or sea-ports, where ships of merchandise unload their traffic, and people resort to buy things necessary for them. Now where should hungry and thirsty souls, and such that have no money, attend, but on the ordinances, the means of grace? where they may expect to meet with Christ, and of "his fulness receive," even "grace for grace." Nor,

3. Do they declare any self-sufficiency in creatures to procure any thing for themselves by their works; for the things to be bought, "wine and milk," suitable to thirsty persons, signify either the doctrines of the gospel, or the blessings of grace, both which are freely given. "Buying," here is not to be taken in a proper sense, for no valuable consideration can be given to God for his grace; but in an improper one, the manner in which these things were to be bought, being "without price;" and besides, the persons who are called upon to buy, are said to "have no money." This explanation of the words in the several parts of them, will help us to understand the advice and invitation given in other places; such as Rev. iii. 18, and xxii. 17.

SECTION XVI.

Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near.—ISA. lv. 6.

THIS passage of Scripture is no proof of a day of grace, which, if men improve, they may enjoy the favour of God; but if they let it slip, if it is once elapsed, there is no more opportunity of meeting with him.

1. They are an exhortation to public worship, signified by "seek-

* Gataker in Poli Synops. in loc.

ing the Lord and calling upon him;" the time for which, with the Jews, was on the seventh day of the week, and with us Christians, on the first; these being "times in which he might be found," it became the Jews of old, and us now, to attend public ordinances, in expectation of meeting with God; since he has promised his people to be in the midst of them, when they are met together.

2. The words may be so rendered, as that they may be understood of place as well as time: "Seek ye the Lord," בְּהִנְחָצוֹ, "in his being found, call ye upon him" קִרְבֵּי בְּהִיטוֹ, "in his being near," that is, in the place where he is to be found, and in the place where he is near. Now, though God is every where, and in all places, yet, in the Old Testament dispensation, there was a particular place for public worship appointed, where God vouchsafed his presence, and where it was both the duty and interest of his people to attend; and though, under the gospel dispensation, all places are alike, yet where the saints agree to meet together, there God has promised to be in the midst of them; and, therefore, there should he be sought and called upon.

3. The words may have a particular regard to Christ's being on earth in the land of Judea; seeing he is spoken of under the name of David, ver. 3, and is promised to be "given for a witness to the people, a leader, and commander of the people," ver. 4, and it is prophesied of him, that there should be a large concourse of the Gentiles to him, ver. 5, who are here encouraged, or rather the Jews, to seek unto him, and call upon him while he was in their land, near unto them; when they had the advantage of his personal presence, ministry, and miracles.

SECTION XVII.

Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.—ISA. lv. 7.

I. THESE words are represented * as a promise of pardon, on condition of forsaking sinful ways and thoughts and turning to the Lord; which, if not in man's power to perform, is to promise on an impossible condition, and that is, indeed, to promise nothing. To which may be replied,

1. That forsaking sin, and turning to the Lord at first conversion, or returning to him after backsliding, which perhaps may be here meant, are not owing to the power of man, but to the efficacious grace of God. None can truly forsake sin, or heartily turn to the Lord, but such who are influenced by the Spirit of God; hence says Ephraim, "Turn thou me, and I shall be turned."†

2. That the promise of pardon is free, absolute, and unconditional, not depending on any condition whatever to be performed by men; forsaking sinful ways and thoughts, and returning to the Lord, are not here proposed as conditions of obtaining mercy, and receiving pardon; but the declarations of pardoning grace and mercy here made, are made on purpose to encourage souls sensible of the wickedness of their ways, and unrighteousness of their thoughts, to return to the Lord, who is a God of grace and mercy.

3. Though faith and repentance are not conditions of pardon, nor

* Whitby, p. 242; ed. 2 236.

† Jer. xxxi. 18.

in the power of man, of himself, to perform: yet as pardon is promised to such who repent, believe, and turn to the Lord, so all such, to whom God makes the promise of pardon, he gives the graces of faith and repentance: hence his promise is not vain, empty, and delusory.

II. It is said,* that "if conversion is wrought only by the unfrustrable operation of God, and man is purely passive in it, vain are the promises of pardon, such as this; for no promises can be means proper to make a dead man live, or to prevail upon a man to act, who must be purely passive." To which I answer,

1. That these words contain no promise to dead men; but a declaration of pardoning grace to sensible sinners; who were "wicked" and "unrighteous" in their own apprehensions, being represented as "thirsty," ver. 1, seeking after the way of life and salvation; though they took the wrong "way," and had their "thoughts" wrongly turned to "spend money for that which is not bread," and their "labour for that which satisfieth not," ver. 2, and therefore remained oppressed with a sense of sin; hence they are here encouraged to quit their own "way" of salvation, and all "thoughts" of their own righteousness, and alone to seek the Lord for mercy and pardon; since his "thoughts" were "not as" their "thoughts" nor his "ways as" their "ways."

2. Admitting them to be a promise of pardon made to dead men, it may be thought to be a proper and sufficient means in the hand of God, under the mighty influences of his Spirit and grace, to make dead men live; since "the gospel is the power of God unto salvation," the "ministration of life," yea, "the savour of life unto life;"† and especially when it is observed what is said in ver. 10, 11,—*"For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth,"* now at this present time delivered, in ver. 7—9: *"It shall not return unto me void; but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."*

3. Though man is passive in regeneration, yet he is active in forsaking sin and turning to the Lord. Promises of pardon may, through the grace of God, prevail on such to act in these instances, who have been passive in the work of regeneration; for regeneration antecedes these; forsaking sin, and turning to the Lord, follow upon, and rise from regenerating grace. No man can truly do these, until he is regenerated by the Spirit of God. It follows then, that men may be prevailed upon, by the promises of pardon, to act, who have been passive in regeneration.

III. It is intimated, that such who are in the Calvinistical way of thinking, say that God promises pardon and life to the non-elect, on condition of their faith and repentance:‡ and it is asked, "How can a God of truth and sincerity be said to promise to them pardon and salvation, seriously and in good earnest, who are, by his own act of preterition, infallibly and unfrustrably excluded from it?"

* Whitby, pp. 237, 242; ed. 2. 231, 236. † Rom. i. 16; 2 Cor. ii. 16, and iii. 6.

‡ Whitby, p. 243; ed. 2. 237.

Extensive Reformation and Revival in the Church, preceded by Trial and Suffering.

THERE is a great tendency, even with good men, to seek the crown without the cross. No affliction for the present is joyous, but grievous; and therefore do all men—saints as well as others—in the first instance, naturally desire exemption from suffering. The believer, too, concerned for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom, and preferring the good of Zion above his chief joy, is prone to look for the triumph of truth and righteousness, and for abundant prosperity to the church, with no antecedent trials.* The plain and reiterated declarations of the inspired Word, the experience of the saints in all ages, and the dispensations of divine Providence towards the church,—all testify to the fallacious nature of such expectations, and unite in proclaiming it as a royal and unalterable law of the Redeemer's administration, that it is through manifold tribulations we must inherit the kingdom of heaven. They point to a season of suffering, as preceding or accompanying every real and extensive reform or revival in the church, and they declare that those individuals who, in any age or country, have been approved instruments of reformation, have been frequently qualified for their important work by being subjected to peculiar trials, and have been exposed to more than an ordinary share of difficulties and afflictions in the honourable post which was assigned them to occupy. For the present, we pass over the consideration of the believer's individual afflictions, needful as they are for the promotion of his sanctification, and as a preparation for future glory; and propose merely to offer a few illustrations of the position, that those who have been owned as witnesses for the Redeemer's cause, or who have done extensive good in their generation, have always had to endure affliction and trial; and that when multiplied blessings were about to be conferred on the church, or through her, bestowed on the world, she has been previously in a low and despised condition, or called to pass through the fire and water of manifold and diversified afflictions.

It seems to be a rule, to which there is no exception, that all who are decided for the Redeemer, and who are devoted to the advancement of his cause, must bear the brunt of the world's opposition and reproach, and must encounter enmity and trials, from which a less decided course would exempt them. Of this the Saviour fully and plainly forewarns them: "In the world ye shall have tribulation." "The servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you: if they keep my sayings, they will keep yours also." "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake." "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution."

The trials of the public servants of Christ may be of different kinds. They may arise from various quarters, and they may be sent to accomplish different parts of one complex gracious design. Sometimes there are great evils in themselves, which require strong and repeated rods to correct and eradicate them. Sometimes the state of the church and of the world renders the work of a faithful witness and honest reformer more than usually arduous and trying; and sometimes the change to be effected requires examples of heroic devotedness, patience in tribulation, and eminent disinterestedness for its accomplishment. The afflictions to be endured may spring more immediately from the buffetings of Satan; they

* In the exercise of the amiable retiring disposition for which he was characterized, the late Dr. Mason, of Wishawtown, threw out the conjecture, that the slaying of the witnesses may be already past. It was natural for a good man to desire this—but neither the testimony of prophecy nor the state of the nations affords any support to the supposition.

may arise from the opposition and reproach of a world in arms, from the abettors of evil systems, from men in power, or the multitude who cannot bear to have their principles and conduct condemned by the testimony and example of consistent witnesses, or their schemes of interest or pleasure disturbed; or they may come directly from the hand of God as a sovereign, in afflictions on their persons, or trials with respect to their outward conditions and relations. But in whatever way, and from whatever quarter troubles may be sent to faithful men, they may certainly calculate on having to undergo them. Their own purification renders them necessary. In a world under the usurped dominion of the prince of darkness and his instruments, arrayed in determined hostility to the Messiah and those who bear his image, they can never be favourites, nor can their cause be popular; and those who are honoured to advance the church's purity or prosperity, must, like the venerable apostle of the Gentiles, "fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in their flesh for his body's sake, which is the church."* Those sufferings for the church which were substitutionary, expiatory, and meritorious, were all borne by Him who loved the church and gave himself for her. Those which are obediential, exemplary, and purifying, form one great aggregate, to be borne by the whole mystical body of Christ, and of which martyrs, confessors, and all approved public servants have allotted to them a principal share. It is not alone to times of general prevailing irreligion, or of open persecution, that the prophet's declaration is applicable—"He that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey."† Let a man forsake the camp of the ungodly, let him separate himself from the received principles and usages of the society around him—let him, recognising the claims of the Redeemer to his entire service of heart and life, devote his energies to the promotion of the cause of the Redeemer's glory, and of universal holiness, and he will be accounted a fool or a madman. The vocabulary of abuse will be exhausted in applying the most odious appellations to his spirit, principles, or conduct, and either in character, or person, or property, he will be reputed a "prey," which persons who dislike the truth may seize and tear to pieces, whenever a fitting opportunity is presented. The excellent John Newton‡ justly remarks, "When God is about to perform some great work, he generally permits some great opposition to it. Suppose Pharaoh had acquiesced in the departure of the children of Israel, or that they had met with no difficulties in the way, they would, indeed, have passed from Egypt to Canaan with ease, but they, as well as the church in all future ages, would have been great losers. The wonder-working God would not have been seen in those extremities which make his arm so visible."

Examples of those "who wrought righteousness," and "obtained a good report," having been exposed to peculiar trials for the truth's sake, are numerous in every part of the inspired volume—are conspicuously displayed in both the Old and New Testament Scriptures. Joseph was to be employed in an elevated station, in accomplishing the divine purpose towards the church, and he was early schooled in adversity. He was hated of his brethren—sold into slavery—afterwards cast into prison through the machinations of a wicked mistress—and his kindness to his fellow-prisoner requited with ingratitude and neglect. In all the instances in which affliction befell him, his innocence was apparent. The Lord prepared him by a severe and lengthened training for the important ministry that awaited him, and showed him that humility was the appointed path to true honour, and that the service which he was to render to the church, was to be offered at the expense of much personal trial and distress to himself. Thus was it also with Moses, the appointed deliverer of Israel, who

* Colossians, i. 24.

† Isaiah, lix. 15.

‡ Memoirs.

has this high testimony, that he was "*faithful in all his house.*" In infancy he was exposed to imminent hazard of life: and his very name carried with it the record of deliverance from a watery death.* True it is, he is said to have "*chosen affliction with the people of God,*" rather than the pleasures of sin; but he knew of a certainty—being divinely taught—that there was no other way of accomplishing his important mission, and that only by a lot of privation and trial, could he keep his garments clean, or effect the emancipation of Israel from their degrading servitude. Nor alone in his expulsion from Egypt, and in his exile in the land of Midian, did he fill up his allotted part of "the sufferings of Christ for his body's sake." He had to bear the hardships of the wilderness; he endured the murmuring and rebellion of the people during every part of the painful march. He had to witness the judgments of Heaven poured out upon the rebels; in the bitterness and anguish of his spirit, he oftentimes stood in the breach that the Lord might not make a full end; and even at the close of his distinguished course, he was denied his earnest desire, and debarred an entrance into Canaan, because of the sin into which the rebellion of Israel had betrayed him.

It is needless to adduce other examples of the sufferings and trials of eminent servants of Christ under the Old Testament. The histories of David, Elijah, Hezekiah, Isaiah, Nehemiah, the prophets, and other distinguished men who were instruments of reformation and revival, supply many striking confirmations of the truth, that the good designed for Zion was effected by the personal sufferings of the Lord's approved messengers, not less than by their heroic spirit, or the principles which they held.

The Redeemer himself was emphatically the "man who saw affliction by the rod of Jehovah's anger"—the prince of sufferers—while he was the blessed deliverer who came out of Zion—the author of all genuine reformation and revival in the church. As the glorious Head, he taught, by the sufferings to which he voluntarily submitted, an impressive lesson to all his followers. To be partakers with him in his sufferings, and to be made conformable to his death, are badges of genuine discipleship; and they who are most devoted to his service, and most conformed to his image, may expect, like him, to endure "great contradiction of sinners" against them, and to be hated of all men for his name's sake. The apostles of the Lamb exemplify this truth. In the call of the apostle Paul—who laboured more abundantly than all his fellows, and whose labours were singularly owned for promoting extensive revival—a lot of suffering occupied a principal place. "The Lord said unto him," (to Ananias,) "go thy way; for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel; for I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake."† It is not said, "how great things he must do," but, "how great things he must suffer"—clearly implying that the grace given him was to be displayed in manifold trials.—that his honour, as chiefest of the apostles, lay in a double measure of affliction for Christ's name's sake, and that thus was he to perform a ministry of incalculable benefit to the church throughout all succeeding generations. None of his fellows in the apostleship were exempted from a suffering condition. They were esteemed the offscouring of all things—exposed to the imbittered hostility of Jews and Gentiles—in privations and perils often—accounted frequently as enemies even by those who had professed subjection to the truth—and it has generally been thought that all of them suffered violent deaths, and sealed the testimony which they held

* The name *Moses* is from a Hebrew verb which signifies to draw out of, in allusion to his being drawn out of the waters of the Nile.

† Acts v. 15, 16.

with their blood. By the sacrifice of ease, reputation, life, they procured the church's liberty, spread the light of divine truth over regions that had long been immersed in midnight darkness, and were instruments of the most powerful and extensive revival that ever took place in the church. Did they estimate the purchase as too costly, or repine at the appointment which called them to continued and incessant privation and suffering, for the advancement of the Redeemer's cause? On the other hand, they rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name's sake of Christ,—they took joyfully the spoiling of their goods,—and all things they estimated as loss and dung, that they might win Christ, and be found in him. The spirit of one, was the spirit of them all. "None of the trials which they endured, moved them, neither reckoned they their lives dear to themselves, so that they might finish their course with joy, and the ministry which they had received of the Lord Jesus."

A similar condition of suffering and trial was allotted to the Reformers and martyrs of the Lamb, as they accomplished their high and honourable mission. None of them could boast of popularity with an ungodly world, or among the members of an idolatrous or declining church. On the other hand they had to face dangers and perils from every quarter; their life was often the sacrifice; their character and reputation in their own day were generally covered with reproach and calumny; and from professed friends and open enemies they were exposed to unceasing warfare. Through what Luther styles "the school of temptation," they passed onward to the throne, to which they were exalted to judge the tribes of Israel. Satan and his chosen instruments assailed them with every species of malignity and violence; and they found no discharge in that war, till they had finished their glorious course, and overcome the Adversary by the blood of the Lamb and the word of their testimony.

The real state of the quarrel is not materially altered in our day, nor will it be altered, till Antichrist being destroyed and the truth being universally ascendant, the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, and the saints of the Most High God shall take the kingdom and possess it. In a time of silken profession and the decline of practical godliness, there is a strong temptation to overlook this feature of the Redeemer's dispensations towards the church and his approved servants. But assuredly the offence of the cross has not ceased; a faithful testimony is no better relished by the erroneous, or immoral, or time-serving, than it was in any by-past age; and those who would be instrumental in doing any good work for the Redeemer, must relinquish ease, profit, and good name, and lay their account with privations and sufferings of various kinds, in labouring to promote the ascendancy of truth and holiness. Like Gideon's *three hundred*, whom the Lord honoured with a notable victory, they must be willing to "endure hardness," while they are distinguished for holy and ardent zeal for the advancement of the cause of righteousness. The witnesses must be content—must rejoice to wear their sackcloth, till Babylon's downfall. This last great trial draws on apace, and neither they, nor their cause will obtain popularity, until their dead bodies shall be re-animated, and they shall ascend to heaven in the sight of their enemies. Enough for them, that in their privations and sufferings, they "go without the camp," to Jesus, bearing his reproach, and that they walk by the footsteps of the flock of slaughter. Their sufferings and trials serve to confirm the faith and animate the hopes of the faithful; and contribute a most important part to the final triumph of the cause of righteousness. To conclude, we notice a few of the eminent privileges which are peculiarly enjoyed by the public servants of Christ, when subjected to privations or suffering in his cause.

1. *Theirs is an honoured condition.* They are the men whom the

King delights to honour. Instead of conferring upon them the unsubstantial honours of the world, he enrolls them among those of whom the world was not worthy. They are made partakers of Christ's sufferings. Their badge of distinction is to bear about in their bodies the death of their exalted Master, that the life of Jesus also may be made manifest in their bodies. "The spirit of glory and of God resteth upon them." By patient continuance in well-doing, they overcome the ills of time, as they were enabled to renounce its pleasures and enjoyments. They are kings and priests to God and the Lamb, and even in death they reign over enemies. The most honoured post in all the army of the Captain of salvation, is that of greatest difficulty and danger, of suffering and arduous service. Well may those who are called to occupy it, wonder and rejoice that they should be "counted worthy to suffer shame" in the cause of their exalted and glorious Master.

2. *Theirs are great supports.* The Lord has pledged himself to stand by his servants; to aid them by his Spirit; and to give them a mouth and wisdom, which no adversary shall be able to gainsay or resist. Enemies may fight against them, but they cannot prevail against them: and no weapon formed against them can prosper. The Lord sustains them mightily by his right hand; and when they are in péril or danger, He rides on the heavens for their speedy help, and frequently, in a way wondrous and unexpected, confounds those who oppose them, and works for them deliverance. "At my first answer," says the venerable apostle, "no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge." "Notwithstanding," he adds, "the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles might hear; and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion." And hence he triumphs in future deliverance and victory—"And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom."* With such gracious deliverances and assurances have the servants of Christ been frequently favoured, when called to contend with the opposition and cruelty of enemies, and the cowardice and treachery of brethren, while pleading the Redeemer's cause.

3. *They have reaped the precious fruits of sanctified trials.* Their own spirits have been subdued. They have learned lessons of humility, patience, and meekness, which could not have been acquired so effectually as in the school of affliction. Theirs has been "the peace that passeth understanding," even when all without was tumult and confusion. The candle of the Lord has shone upon their head, and light has beamed on their tabernacle, while the enemy has employed his every artifice to cover their names and cause with the thickest clouds. They have been made partakers of the joy of God's salvation. Elevated on the mount of arduous duty, or trial, they have been privileged with discoveries of the divine glory, and visions of the land that is afar off. Foretastes of heaven have been vouchsafed to them in the wilderness;—and as a compensation for every trial, they have obtained the witness of the Spirit, and been enabled to read their title clear to a mansion in the skies. The joyful assurance of one eminent witness and sufferer, has been, in some measure, that of all who have succeeded him, in the same holy warfare—"I reckon, that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us;"—nothing "shall separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."†

4. *Their trials subserve the most valuable and excellent purposes.* They attest the truth and faithfulness of the God of Zion. They strengthen and animate the faithful;—encourage some to join themselves to the Lord and

* 2 Timothy, iv. 16, 17, 18.

† Romans, viii. 18, 33.

his people,—and strike dismay into the hearts of the enemies of truth, and ensure their future destruction. The sufferings of faithful men are a grand means of sealing up important truths, displaying their value and excellency, and transmitting them as a costly and inalienable inheritance, to future generations. They eminently tend to purify the church, and are an important means of the world's conversion. As the public trials of the saints are all needful, so when they have severally and collectively come to a termination, they will conduce, in an inconceivable degree, to set off the beauty and brightness of the church's millennial state, and of her triumphant condition in heaven. Objects are often glorious and attractive by contrast;—and how surpassing will be the glory of Zion, when all her faithful sons shall appear as crowned conquerors, shall stand upon the sea of glass mingled with fire, having gotten the victory over the Beast and his image, and his mark, and the number of his name, and shall wave their palms for ever in honour of him that loved them and gave himself for them.—*Belfast Covenanter.*

Jesus is precious.

The Lord Jesus resembles a precious stone, which has various points of radiancy, and from which many different lights of consolation and joy proceed. According to the necessity of the circumstances in which we are placed, sometimes one side, and sometimes another appears pre-eminently lovely; and there is no situation and no emergency in which we do not find Jesus efficacious in one of his aspects. For example, to the bruised heart we would represent Christ as the friend of sinners; to the weak and timid soul, we will show him as a hero, ready to overcome all their enemies; to the sick and afflicted, he is the unwearied physician; to the maimed and cripple, the tender nurse; and to those trembling ones, who know not how they are to stand at the judgment seat of God, we should exhibit him as the Lord who is our righteousness. Thus, if I may so express it, the heavenly Father turns Christ as a precious stone before the eyes of the people of Israel, according to their necessities; and in the mirror of the revelations makes his colour to be reflected, and his lights come forth, sometimes from one side, sometimes from another. This can be discerned through every period of sacred history; for there is always one side of the image of the Messiah turned toward us, more clearly marked than the others, or bearing a more characteristic stamp; it is always that which is most suitable to the necessity of the time.—*Krummacher.*

Perfectionists.—From the Register published at De Ruyter, Madison county, New York, we learn that a sect of perfectionists exist in that village, “who claim to be as holy as was Jesus Christ. And even those who once occupied stations in respectable society, and walked in the higher circles of life, debase themselves to kiss the feet of their leader, and adore him as the very Christ!” They deny the sacredness of the marriage rite, and by their principles and practices grossly outrage the proprieties of life. Such facts should be chronicled as part of the history of the times.—*N. Y. Obs.*

Important Decision respecting a Witness.—The Augusta Chronicle states that Judge Andrews, of the northern Circuit, (Georgia,) held

at the late term of the superior Court, of Oglethorpe county—in a capital case—decided that a person could not be sworn as a witness in a Court of Justice, who did not believe in the existence of a God, the obligations of an oath, and a future state of rewards and punishments. He maintained with the Supreme Court of New York, that “Religion is a subject in which every man has a right to think according to the dictates of his understanding. It is a solemn concern between his conscience and his God; with which no human tribunal has a right to meddle. But in the development of facts, and the ascertainment of truth, human tribunals have a right to interfere. They are bound to see that no man’s rights are impaired or taken away, but through the medium of testimony entitled to belief; and no testimony is entitled to credit, unless delivered under the solemnity of an oath, which comes home to the conscience of the witness, who will treat a lie from his belief, that false swearing would expose him to punishment in the life to come. On this great principle rest all our institutions, and especially the distribution of justice between men.”

Universalists must look to this matter. They have treated this opinion as a slander when urged in theological disputes. But when it becomes a part of the common law of the land, it is a more serious matter. If a man is not to be believed *under oath*, what is to be the estimate of his credibility when free from its solemnities?

Remarks on the Article of Parepidemos.

PAREPIDEMOS, who has taken up the cudgels against the ultraism of some temperance advocates, is, in my opinion, correct in the main. That *fermented* drinks may be lawfully used,—that they are not, under all circumstances, poisonous, can scarcely admit of question, and has not, so far as I know, been questioned. Parepidemos certainly establishes his proposition; but in his zeal against error and ultraism, has he not fallen into both himself? The first argument is drawn from Joel iii. 18. In his remarks upon this passage, it is taken for granted, that “wine,” in this place, signifies a *fermented* liquor. This is an entire mistake. The word is *tyros*, “*ghasoy*,” which *always* means *must*,—it *never* means a *fermented* liquor. In Song. viii. 2, it is very properly translated “juice.” Unless he is more correct in his other scripture references, this writer will not gain much upon our confidence.

Parepidemos remarks that he “has not examined any passage, where ‘*tyros*’ is called a blessing.” This is a cautious expression, but as the writer refers frequently to the original, and professes to have been engaged in examining it, his statement is calculated to mislead the unlearned reader. If he will turn to Gen. xxvii. 28, he will find this word used in pronouncing a blessing upon Jacob, by Isaac. But this is not all. If he will look again at Prov. xx. 1, “wine is a mocker,” he will discover that the original word there is not “*tyros*,” as he affirms, but “*yayin*.” By making such a misstatement,—a misstatement that could not have been made, had he taken the trouble to look at the text, Parepidemos betrays to the cautious reader the very important fact, that *he has made declarations respecting the original terms which have a bearing upon the argument, without examining them at all.* This, no writer profes-

sedly critical, should permit himself to do. It weakens the confidence of the unlearned.

Besides, P. is in error respecting the use and meaning of this word *tyrosh*. There is abundant proof that its true meaning is *unfermented grape juice*, Is. lxxv. 8, "As the *new wine*,—*tyrosh*, is found in the cluster." The word signifies, in this place, the juice of the grape before it is expressed. Prov. iii. 10. "And thy presses shall burst out with *new wine*,—*tyrosh*." The word here, manifestly means *grape juice*, for it is under the *press*, not yet even in the vat. From the connexion, we learn that the "bursting out," was not from the process of fermentation, but from *abundance*. Joel ii. 24, we find this word used nearly in the same way, to signify the juice of the grape when in the vat, and overflowing it; as your readers have seen the tubs under a cider press, while the *must* was *actually running*. Consequently, in this text, *tyrosh* signifies *unfermented juice*. Again, (and this is a use of the word, that of itself is nearly enough to show that P. is in error respecting it,) in Mic. vi. 15, it is used to signify *a grape*—"Thou shalt tread—sweet wine, *tyrosh*—but shalt not drink wine." Moreover, in this text, the *tyrosh* and *yayin* are so contrasted, that we have no difficulty in ascertaining that the one signifies *the juice*, or, in this text, the *grape*, and the other, a fermented liquor formed from it. Finally, on this word, P. affirms one thing, and I will another. It is *never* used in a connexion that necessarily requires it to be translated *wine*, meaning *fermented wine*. In Hos. iv. 11, it certainly does not signify the same thing with *yayin*, used in the same verse. The best view of that text is, that it signifies *must*, which might readily be so used as to stupify; at least, like "whoredom," corrupt by other evils arising from its free use, in social festivities, although it had no intoxicating property.

But, I find more fault with the remarks of P. concerning the Rechabites. I think him wrong in almost all his observations. At present, I notice only one particular. He says that they "refrained from drinking wine, at the command of the Lord by Jeremiah,"—that is to say, "obeying man, rather than God;" and all through "their superstitious adherence to their father's command." This is a heavy charge against the good Rechabites, *if it be true*, which it is *not*. This is another instance of P.'s loose way of quoting and referring to the Scriptures. If God gave any "command" to the Rechabites by Jeremiah, to drink wine, I have been entirely unable to discover it in the passage. I find, indeed, that in Jer. xxxv. 21, this prophet is directed to "give them wine to drink," and ver. 5, Jeremiah said, "Drink ye wine:" but no where is it hinted even, that God commanded them to disobey their father. So far from this, that God commends and blesses them, which he would not have done, if they had been living, in these many instances, in sin: ver. 18, 19. "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Because ye have obeyed the commandment of Jonadab, your father, and kept all his precepts, and done according unto all that he hath commanded you: Therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Jonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me for ever." Show me such a promise to any man for drinking wine, which, in the opinion of some, God has commanded to be used as an ordinary beverage!

While I make these criticisms, I repeat, that with P.'s main proposition I agree, and think it easily established: but I must add, that to my mind, another proposition is equally clear, and can be as easily established; namely, *that God did not intend intoxicating liquors for habitual use, and that such use is a perversion of them, and impairs the beauty and force of the analogy, in the Lord's Supper.* W.

Fermented Wine: its Use in the Sacrament, Right and Scriptural, in Reply to the Novelties of the Rev. Mr. Gilmour: By the Rev. J. Stark, Minister of Carlsdyke, Greenock.

A NEW controversy has been started in the church. We have been accustomed to employ fermented wine in the dispensation of the Lord's Supper: and we have never imagined that there was any impropriety in doing so—much less, that we were violating the plain letter of the scriptures. We were persuaded,—whether correctly or not,—that we were thus following the example of the primitive Christians—of the apostles—of our Saviour himself. Now, however, the time-honoured practice has been condemned, and in no measured terms. Fermented wine is said to be “a demonstrated evil,”*—to be denounced everywhere by scripture, though, conveniently enough, no passage is produced in favour of the assertion,—to be “an impure liquor,”—“a vile thing,”—“a demonstrated curse,”—and almost every kind of type has been employed—common, capital, and italic, to impress upon the public mind its newly-discovered abominations. And it will readily be admitted, that if these charges are all founded in truth, we and our fathers have erred grievously in the administration of that solemn ordinance. But if, on the other hand, it shall turn out that they have been preferred against us rashly, and without even the shadow of evidence in their support,—if it shall be found that fermented wine, *as such*, is no where condemned in scripture, but approved of, and that it was used by our Saviour and his apostles,—then surely we will be entitled to rebuke the men who, without cause, are breaking up the peace and unity of the church.

That fermented wine was in common use amongst the Jews, is very obvious, one would think, to every reader of the Bible. But why then meddle with this controversy at all? There is a necessity for doing something in the matter. Silence is construed into defeat. We are silent only because if we *do speak*, it must be to plead guilty to the charge brought against us. Meanwhile the evil spreads. The idea was first mooted a few years ago, on the other side of the Atlantic, where every kind of religious error will soon find a host of supporters. Some one hinted, that if it was wrong to use fermented liquor at his own table, it could not be right to use it at the table of the Lord. This is the origin of the present controversy. The hint was taken up and repeated; what has been the consequence? Shameful divisions in the church, while many congregations actually use *water* instead of *wine*, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper! And should we not try to prevent such unseemly scenes among ourselves?

* See “Sacramental Wines,” by the Rev. Mr. Gilmour.

More than a year ago, a member of my congregation refused to communicate, because wine was used, coolly affirming that it was forbidden by scripture, and that he would prefer water. I was much startled at the *profane* remark, but when I saw the tract which he had been reading, I was not surprised. I would not hurt the feelings of a Christian, by quoting any of its foul and scandalous untruths.

The pamphlet on this subject, by the Rev. Mr. Gilmour, has some claims on our attention. It is very plausible in many of its statements, which are calculated at first sight to make an impression on the mind; a good deal of apparent evidence is adduced in favour of his views; and what is wanting in argument—and that is not little—is far more than made up by the unbounded confidence which the author has in the justice of his cause. He asserts without fear of contradiction; he argues and defies reply. All is as clear to him as noon-day; there cannot, in his estimation, be two opinions about it. And yet all the while he has had some dread of an opponent. Towards the close, he makes some remarks which seem designed to frighten any one from a reply. Thus he speaks of “the shallow, the superficial, the interested, the prejudiced, and the weak” as being arrayed against him, and he “begs” of them not to set aside his conclusions “with a sneer or a witticism.” And again, in the very same page, he informs us, that some of the objections made to his sentiments on this subject, arising from “mere animal taste,”—(this is a little too bad, to brand a man as a *drunkard*, because he does not happen to agree with him as to the kind of wine which should be used in the sacrament,)—“are quite worthy of a spoiled child,” (what a beautiful allusion!) “or of a sick girl,” (so even a sick girl must not be allowed to taste a drop of wine—I thought our author had been more *gallant*!)—“or of a bearded boy who should yet be in the nurse’s string:” what does Mr. Gilmour mean? If this passage has any meaning at all—and I am strongly disposed to think that it has none, not even a particle of it—it is a wild denunciation of vengeance against every man who shall dare to contradict any of his statements. I do not know in which of these classes of characters I shall be ranked, but it is pretty certain that I run considerable risk in this matter, as I intend not to set aside his “conclusions” merely, but his premises also. I shall endeavour to do so, however, in such a mild and gentle manner—though there is no little provocation given—as that the author and reviewer shall part on the best possible terms.

One of his strongest arguments, at least one on which he lays a good deal of stress, is drawn from the meaning of the word “wine” in Hebrew, which, on the authority of Dr. Clarke and others, he says, means simply “the expressed juice of the grape.” Now, what does this prove? Does it follow that it was not fermented after it was expressed? Where is the use, in a grave controversy like this, of running away with a phrase? Surely Mr. Gilmour does not intend to play upon words! Yet he has never attempted to show that the authors from whom he quotes attached that meaning to these words. Parkhurst, in his Hebrew Lexicon, under the word, gives the very same definition, and yet he would have been perfectly astonished at such a comment as this. He, too, calls it “the expressed juice of

grapes;" and what is the very first passage of Scripture which he quotes in proof, and in illustration? Genesis ix. 21; "and he," that is Noah, "drank of the wine, and was *drunken*." So that it is quite possible for a person to use the words on which Mr. G. grounds his argument, while he would deprecate the meaning thus affixed to them. I will not say that this mode of reasoning is worthy "of a spoiled child, or of a sick girl, or of a bearded boy," but to speak within bounds, the folly of it is remarkable.

Not a whit better is the argument, drawn from the Scripture phrase, *new wine*, which he calls "newly expressed juice of the grape." For it is absolutely certain that *new* or *sweet* wine was intoxicating, and consequently fermented. On the day of Pentecost the apostles began to speak with other tongues, and the Jews who dwelt at Jerusalem, not understanding them, imagined that, like men under the influence of liquor, they were merely uttering confused and unintelligible sounds. "These men are full of new wine." And did Peter say, what Mr. Gilmour ventures with great hardihood to assert, that new wine could not intoxicate, that it was unfermented,—the expressed juice of the grape? Not at all; and his authority is somewhat better than Mr. Gilmour's. He admitted that it *would* intoxicate, for his answer is founded, not on the kind or quality of the liquor, but on the fact that no one drank wine at so early an hour of the day. "These are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day." That was the hour of prayer; nine o'clock in the morning; and it was not customary to eat and drink before that time. How absurd would the accusation have been, if new wine did not intoxicate! And how inappropriate and uncalled for, would have been the grave and serious answer of the apostle!* "Thus far," says our author very innocently, "thus far, we think, there can be no diversity of sentiment." Indeed! really this is taxing our credulity rather much. We beg to put in a disclaimer. There *is* a diversity of sentiment; we are not yet agreed.

It is perfectly amazing to observe how far preconceived opinions will impose upon a man's judgment; nay, even upon a man's *eyesight*. Here we have a passage of Scripture quoted by Mr. G., condemning the use of fermented wine, while yet it is as completely in the teeth of his arguments as it is possible for words to be. "Who hath wo? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? who hath babbling? who hath wounds without cause? who hath redness of eyes? They that *tarry long* at the wine; they that go to seek *mixed* wine." Mixed wine was wine mingled with spices to render its intoxicating qualities very powerful; and hence it was given to criminals, who were to be put to death, in order to stupify, and thus render them insensible to their sufferings. But in consequence of its strength, the drunkard desired this wine in preference to any other, and this fact is very properly coupled with *tarrying long* at the wine. And had Mr. G.'s theory been correct, the wise man would not have spoken of *tarrying long* at the wine; "*tarrying*," implying a considerable time, and *tarrying long* being a still stronger phrase, he would have forbidden the use of it altogether.

* See Poole's commentary on the passage, who distinctly affirms that new wine intoxicates.

Instead of this, he only forbids excess; nothing more. What a "conclusion" Mr. G. draws from these premises! If you are told not to *tarry long* at the table, Mr. Gilmour gravely assures you that you are forbidden to *sit down!* If gluttony be condemned in Scripture, then you must not eat. If you are warned against excess, the meaning of that warning is that you are not to taste at all! Admirable reasoning! Allow a man to argue in this way, and he will prove to you any thing you like—no matter how unreasonable or untrue. He may write books by the score, and in support of any error.

But then wine "is employed by the spirit of wisdom and of revelation for the purpose of representing the terrible judgments of God:" and *therefore* it should not be drunk. Now, admitting this to be correctly stated, by what means does he contrive to jump to the conclusion, that being an emblem of divine wrath, it should *not* be drunk? *Fire* and *water* are used as well as wine—as frequently, perhaps—what conclusion would Mr. G. draw from this? "I have consumed thee with the fire of my wrath;" and again, "pour out thy wrath upon the heathen," where the emblem is *rain*—one of the best temporal blessings. What right has he to fix upon one; more than another? He may as well condemn the fire which warms, and the rain which nourishes, because they are "employed by the spirit of wisdom and of revelation for the purpose of representing the terrible judgments of God." He says that there must be two different kinds of wine, when it is spoken of both as a blessing and a curse; and then he infers that the one was fermented, and the other unfermented; and for the same reason he must hold that there are two kinds of fire, and two kinds of rain! for they are the emblems of wrath. Would it not be an idle expenditure of words to refute such an absurd notion as this?

But the fact is, that in his zeal against the use of fermented wine, he has contrived to mistake altogether the meaning of the very passages which he quotes. He makes the *wine* the emblem of wrath, whereas it is the *cup*, without any special reference to its contents. It was customary in ancient times, at a feast, to give a cup of wine to each guest, and there was a variety of wines used, so that each did not get the same kind of wine as his neighbour, and thus a man's cup came to signify *his portion*. In this sense, it is frequently used in Scripture. "The Lord is the portion of mine inheritance, and of *my cup*. Are ye able to drink of the *cup* that I shall drink of? Ye shall drink indeed of *my cup*. Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and a horrible tempest; this shall be the portion of *their cup*." Nay, in order to show that it is the cup that is generally used, and not its contents, as the emblem of wrath, it is spoken of as filled with *water* as well as *wine*. "*Waters* of a full *cup* are wrung out to them." Now if Mr. G. would be consistent with himself—if he would carry out the principles which he has rashly, and without due reflection, adopted, he must condemn the use of water as well as wine. Even a good cause is grievously injured by a bad argument; but a bad cause is ruined by it altogether.

He brings testimony from all quarters, in order to prove that the unfermented juice of the grape *has* been drunk. But what follows? what effect has all this upon the question? Does it prove that fermented wine was *not* drunk, which is the real question at issue?

Mr. G. rejoices exceedingly over this part of his publication, conscious, it would seem, that there he was safe. "We have made out a good case," says he, "and no twelve men in Europe would return a verdict against us of '*Not proven*.' " But what the better would he be of his verdict after all? A thief is accused of stealing a man's watch, and he proves very satisfactorily that he did not steal the man's purse, will the jury be cheated out of their verdict by this defence, and pronounce him an honest man? So Mr. G. shows us that the mere juice of the grape has been used, and then he calls upon us, as if we could not detect the difference, to say that fermented wine was not used. Unless he wishes us to believe this, what is the use of giving us long quotations to prove a fact which no one would take the trouble to deny?

There is a good deal of cleverness displayed in the attempt to show, that the Corinthians were not intoxicated at the table of the Lord, or rather, it should be observed at the love-feast, or perhaps, paschal-supper, immediately before, Mr. G. denies the alleged fact of their intoxication; but his denial, like some of the assertions which we have been considering, must not be taken upon trust. He is contented with amazingly little evidence when it favours his views. His first argument—for in this instance he has more than one—is founded on the meaning of the word. "We frankly admit," he says—but it is somewhat difficult to discover in what the frankness consists, for he only admits what has never been disputed—"we frankly admit that the Greek word, which is here rendered '*drunken*,' literally signifies to eat and drink after sacrifice, and that it is frequently and properly employed by classical writers to denote drinking to intoxication." But in this passage he assures us, that it means to be *plentifully fed*. Now the primary signification of the word, as given by lexicographers, is *to be drunken*; and surely Mr. G. should have produced some undisputed and undisputable examples of its modified signification. But he has not produced *one*; and until he do so, we must take the liberty of demurring to his new translation. The best commentators take the translation as it stands—Scott, for example, Henry's Continuator, and others. Thus Whitby says, in reference to this very passage, "*Methuein, to be drunk*, is by the grammarians thought to have its original from *meta to, thuein*, (after sacrificing,) because of the free drinking they indulged in after their sacrifices. The Judaizing converts thought themselves obliged to drink plentifully at their festivals; four large cups of wine, saith Dr. Lightfoot, at the paschal supper, and to be quite drunk, saith Buxtorf, at the feast of Purim."

"But this is neither our only nor our best argument." So says our author. Would it be wrong to infer from this remark, that he is not very sure of the accuracy of his new translation? Or, like a skilful disputant, has he put his weak argument in front that he may with greater energy and effect bring up his rear? Yet I am strongly disposed to think that he is not doing his first argument justice. It may not be his *only* one, but it is decidedly his *best*. Let the reader judge.

I give the statement in his own words. "We have evidence of a moral kind to offer in confirmation of our sentiments. What does Paul say in the very next verse, after telling them that one was hungry, and another was well filled? (The reader will be pleased to

remember that no such statement is made by the apostle, that he says *drunken*, and not *well-filled*.) He asks them, What! have you not houses to eat and to drink in? What is the meaning of this question? Does he not here give them a license to do that in their own houses which they were not at liberty to do in the house of God?" This is melancholy work! Will it be believed, that the apostle, so far from giving them leave to do in their own houses what he had forbidden them to do in the house of God, does quite the reverse? He *changes* the word in the next verse—gives a different one altogether—one which is always used in a good sense. It is not *methuein*, but *pinein*. So that, in the 21st verse, the apostle forbids drunkenness, and, in the 22d, enjoins temperance; yet we are assured that they both mean the same thing! And Mr. G. actually chuckles over the affair and tries to laugh us out of countenance. "A man's Greek *may* fail him here"—(the plain truth is, that Mr. G. never looked into the *Greek* Testament at all, else he would never have committed such an egregious blunder)—"and the superficial thinker *may* be led astray by the mere jingle of words—(very true! else we had not heard of this argument)—but his common sense should not fail him too." Is not that cleverly managed? "A jingle of words" is of some use after all. Mr. G. should not despise a friend to whom he is so much indebted!

But it seems that "there is no need for either criticism or argument in deciding the question, as Paul expressly frees the Corinthians from the charge of drunkenness." Why then did not Mr. Gilmour tell us this before? Why give us so much both of criticism and of argument, when he could so easily and so conclusively have settled the question by the "express" authority of the apostle Paul? A servant, on one occasion, offered to give twenty reasons to his master for not doing a certain piece of work, but when he mentioned the first, that he was *not able* to do it,—his master stopped him, quietly remarking that the one reason was sufficient, and he had no wish to hear the other nineteen. So in this case, if Mr. G. will but give us the "express" authority of the apostle Paul, we will not require any other argument to convince us. And in what way does the apostle "*expressly* free the Corinthians from the charge of drunkenness?" Here is the passage.—Mr. G. only quotes a part of it,—we shall do his argument more justice than he himself does by quoting it all:—"Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified by the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." Here he says the Apostle frees the Corinthians from drunkenness; and so much importance does he attach to this passage, that he immediately afterwards quotes it a second time,—gives it in large type, which, indeed, he employs very frequently, as if he meant to carry conviction by CAPITALS, and not by argument. But it must be plain to every one, that if it frees the Corinthians from the charge of drunkenness, it frees them also from theft,—even from covetousness,—from speaking evil of their neighbours,—nay, upon Mr. Gilmour's principle, it frees them from all sin! Drunkenness is not specially mentioned, it forms but *one* of the *ten*

crimes which are specified by the apostle. So if any thing be proved by this mode of reasoning, it is,—that the Corinthian church was thoroughly pure. Was that the case? Will Mr. G. have the hardihood to deny that the Corinthians were guilty of other crimes as bad as the one upon which he fixes, if not worse than it? If he had read the epistle carefully,—if he had even read the two verses immediately preceding those on which he has favoured us with a new commentary and a new translation, he could not have failed to observe the folly and the fallacy of such an argument. When the apostle says that they were justified and sanctified, he just says in other words, that they were Christians,—nothing more. But they were not all Christians; and even though they were, they might surely be guilty of sin. In point of fact, they *were* guilty of sin, whatever Mr. Gilmour may affirm to the contrary. There were *schisms* and *heresies* among them,—1 Cor. xi. 18, 19,—is intemperance a worse sin?—or, at all events, upon Mr. Gilmour's principle, how could the Apostle say that they were washed and sanctified, when there were schismatics and heretics as well as drunkards among them? In the 5th chapter, again, 1, 2 verses, he tells them that one of their number had been guilty of a crime which was not so much as named among the Gentiles; and they, instead of mourning, had been puffed up—that is, rejoiced in the commission of the sin. And, not to mention any thing else, in the 15th chapter, and 12th verse, we learn that some of them denied the doctrine of the resurrection:—"how say some among you, that there is no resurrection of the dead?" Now, I should like to know how the apostle could accuse them of all these sins, any more than that of intemperance, while yet they were washed and justified? Mr. G. cannot see any thing but the one sin,—not he. And certainly it is a great and growing evil—the fruitful source of many other crimes—but then it is nothing short of madness to look upon it as the one only vice. And to torture passages of Scripture in this way, however good the intention may be, is just to play into the hands of the infidel. Really Mr. Gilmour should be more cautious; he should not touch the ark of God with so rude a hand, lest he should do incalculably greater harm to religion, than good to the cause which he has so much at heart.

Mr. G. tries to make his readers believe that fermented wine was not used at the passover;* and here also he professes to quote scripture on the subject:—"One express command was, that they should have no leaven or ferment in their houses, neither was there to be any thing leavened or fermented there." Now, there is no such "express command" within the boards of the Bible; no, nor any thing like it. There was to be no leaven, certainly, and in the account of the passover, *leaven* is invariably connected with the word *eat*; but as that would not suit Mr. G's. purpose,—for it would show the most ignorant that it could not refer to *wine*, which can only be *drunk*,—Mr. G. takes good care to quote only a clause

* Why did not Mr. G., when giving us the testimony of converted Jews, give us that of Dr. Wolfe? He is well acquainted with Jewish customs; and when Mr. G. ventured to say to the Doctor, lately when in Greenock, that the Jews did not use fermented wine at the Passover, the Doctor laughed heartily at the simplicity of our author—assuring him that they used *nothing else*. It is very prudent in Mr. G. not to tell this story!

of the verse,—the middle clause too,—though the whole verse was alike pertinent. “Even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses,”—this is all he quotes, thinking that *leaven* would be taken for *fermentation*, which he makes convertible terms. Here again is the whole verse, Exodus xii. 15: “Seven days shall ye *eat* unleavened bread; even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses: for whosoever *eateth* leavened bread, from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel.” Was it without design that the rest of the verse was kept out? If so, it is remarkable enough. Will any man venture to say that fermented wine was here forbidden? Why, it is not even spoken of; and yet if the one half of what Mr. G. has said be true, a flaggon of fermented wine in the house of an Israelite was an inconceivably greater evil than a loaf of unleavened bread. In the course of six verses, the sin of eating leavened bread or having it in the house, is mentioned *nine* times, and *twice* death is mentioned as the punishment of eating it, and yet there is not a single word of that “*demonstrated curse*” about which Mr. G. has written so much. “An express command!” One could afford to laugh at such nonsense, if it were not connected with a grave and serious subject?”

The author of this pamphlet is as far astray as he can possibly be. What he calls unfermented wine is not spoken of in the scriptures at all. The wine spoken of there—and he has himself quoted some proofs of this—was fermented. I defy any man to read a single page without discovering this. Read the history of Noah, Lot, Nadab and Abihu—read the declarations of scripture, come to the New Testament,—you will find the same thing. “Be not drunk with wine wherein is excess,”—was it not fermented? And yet the apostle does not forbid its use, he forbids excess—nothing else. In defending the principle of total abstinence from intoxicating liquors, there is no necessity for taking such ground as is here done. He may be a very warm, but he must be a very unwise friend of the principle, who does so. Every body knows that *wine* has not been the cause of intemperance among us. What drunkard cares for it? He must have a stronger potation—and by stronger potations has become a drunkard. Still it is right to abstain from liquor of every kind, if a man shall think fit to do so; and I am thoroughly persuaded that, if temperance were not condemned as sinful, and if abstinence were made to rest on the danger of acquiring vicious habits, and the personal good to be derived from it, the end in view, which is good, would be more effectually gained.

The advice which Mr. Gilmour gives to private Christians who hold his opinions on this subject, but belong to churches in which fermented wine is used at the communion, calls for severe animadversion. The motive which prompted him to give it is good—the desire to prevent heats and divisions in congregations—and as such is its tendency, I in so far approve of it. But how can Mr. Gilmour reconcile it with what he has written? How can he free himself from the charge of gross and grievous inconsistency? “We are distinctly of opinion,” he says, “that he should, in the mean time, make it a matter of forbearance with his brethren.” What! make such a sinful thing a matter of forbearance? Must the Christian do what the Saviour condemned? Must he tolerate the sacred use

of a liquor which it would have been "foul outrage" to have placed upon his table—"a demonstrated curse—an impure liquor obtained by the putrefaction (?) and corruption (?) of the juice of the grape—a vile thing, which has ruined so many thousands of our brethren both for time and for eternity!" Must he not only forbear with his fellow-Christians but drink it himself also—bad and accursed as it is? Who could have expected such laxity as this? Verily, if such vile and sinful practices are to be tolerated, the hedge of discipline is broken down, and Mr. G. may just as well admit any man to his communion, however erroneous in principle, or profligate in conduct. Let Mr. Gilmour reconsider this matter, and call in the obnoxious pamphlet, regretting, both for his own sake, and that of the Christian church that it was ever issued!

Reformed Presbyterian Synod in Scotland.

This Synod met in Glasgow in October last. The following items are extracted from their minutes.

In the evening sedurent, the following statement was submitted to Court, relative to the wine question, by a committee which had been appointed for that purpose:—"Inasmuch as it is evident, from the papers occasionally laid on the table of Synod, as well as from other sources of information, that a diversity of sentiment exists in regard to the character of the wine that should be employed in the celebration of the Lord's Supper; and as there is reason to believe that this diversity of sentiment is beginning to lead to a diversity of practice in the Church; and as it is desirable that uniformity of practice should, as far as possible, be maintained in agreeableness with the word of God, it is therefore humbly submitted, that the Synod shall give a deliberate expression of its judgment on this question, for the direction of Sessions and of the Church." A very long and interesting discussion took place on this question, after which it was moved and seconded, "that the Synod declare, that, in agreeableness with the word of God, and the subordinate standards of the Church, wine is to be used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper; and as the Scriptures lay down no positive law on the kind of wine that is to be used, it is inexpedient and unwarrantable to innovate in the celebration of the ordinance, and to disturb the edification and peace of the Church, by deviating from the usual practice, and proposing any new regulation on the subject; and Sessions are instructed accordingly." It was also moved and seconded, "that inasmuch as a large portion of the wine used in this country is unquestionably not the same kind of wine that was employed in the institution of the Lord's Supper, and inasmuch as diversity of opinion prevails as to what that wine was, the Synod agree to appoint a committee to examine into this matter and report; at the same time, the Synod resolve, that diversity of sentiment on this point shall not prevent them from enjoying the privileges of the Church, until a final deliverance be given." The first motion was carried. From this decision, Mr. Martin dissented in his own name, and in that of all who might adhere to him, and craved leave to offer reasons at a future period.

Mr. Martin produced his reasons of dissent on the wine question; and Dr. Bates, for separate reasons which he assigned, craved leave to adhere to the dissent. A Committee was appointed to answer these reasons.

The Synod requested Dr. Bates to publish the sentiments which he expressed in Court the preceding evening, regarding the extreme views

of those persons who have refused to communicate in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, on the ground, that it is immoral to use in that ordinance any wine possessing intoxicating qualities. Dr. Bates expressed his willingness to comply with this request, while the Synod, at the same time, declared that, in the decision adopted by them, they had no intention whatever of throwing discredit on the endeavours that are made to suppress abounding intemperance, by abstaining from the use of all intoxicating liquors.

Letters were received and read from the Reformed Presbyterian Synod in Ireland, and from the Eastern Presbytery, who have declined the authority of that Synod. The Court expressed their deep regret that a separation had taken place, and agreed that the papers shall lie on the table.

Mr. Anderson intimated, that, as faithful adherence to the Scriptural principles of the Church is required by the authority of God, and the solemn vows of the ministers and members of the Church, and as members of the Church may soon be exposed to the danger of violating their solemn engagements, and departing from the Covenanted Testimony by the use of the Elective Franchise, thereby implicating themselves in the immoralities of the British Constitution, he intends submitting to the Court, at next meeting, a motion, in reference to the means which ought, without delay, to be employed for preserving the purity and fidelity of the Church. The Synod, considering the great importance of the object in view, and the duty of the Court to employ all proper means for its proper accomplishment, agreed to take up this matter at an early time next meeting.

Answers to the reasons of dissent on the wine question, were now produced by the committee, and adopted. Dr. Bates withdrew his reasons of dissent on hearing them read.

It is not a little remarkable to find these sturdy sons of Cameron falling into the fanaticism of *ultra* new lights in the United States, respecting the use of wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Mr. Gilmour, noticed in another article in the present number, belongs to this body of Christians.

Neither can we perceive how native born citizens of the British empire, would involve "themselves in the immoralities of the British constitution," by the use of the elective franchise unless they should cast their votes to sustain those immoralities, a case not to be supposed. How then can a vote against immorality involve the voter in that immorality any more than a sermon can involve a minister of religion in the immorality against which he preaches? If they were required to take the oath of allegiance there might be room for debate. But they are a hair-splitting community, apparently on the eve of dissolution. Peace be with the *disjecta membra*. They have sustained many a sharp conflict for the "crown rights of Zion's King," mingled with some error, and much ardent zeal. We mean no offence; and trust our worthy neighbour of Cherry Street will not regard us as treading upon his ground, especially as we intend ere long, if circumstances permit, to take a favourable notice of some things in "*Distinctive Principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, by Rev. David Scott, of Albany.*"

American Tract Society.

I observed in the Presbyterian of the 10th of July, an article from "the Watchman of the South," complaining of the want of courtesy

exhibited by the "American Tract Society" for neglecting or refusing to permit the Presbyterian Church to be represented in its publishing committee, at which neglect or refusal many of our clergy and people feel very much hurt, and the dissatisfaction throughout the Church is extensive and strong.

It appears also from this article, that private humble remonstrances have been sent on behalf of the Church to the Society, and efforts have been made to amend this matter, or in other words to induce the Society to *respect* the Presbyterian Church, which "have been powerless," and that "our churches and ministers so far as they understand the facts of the case, have for some time been induced to give their funds and their countenance to the American Tract Society *only in the hope of a change.*"

Now these facts are all new to me, and I venture to say that there are not twenty Presbyterians within the territorial limits of the Presbytery in which I reside (the Newton Presbytery) who have ever before heard of them; but these facts are of momentous importance, and should be spread before the Church. The fact that the Church of Jesus Christ should appear by her representatives either public or *private*, as a humble suppliant for *respect* at the footstool of any institution, and when her prayer is disregarded, should still kneel and supplicate with feelings of mortification and dissatisfaction, is surely one of deep import; it should lead us as a Church to the mercy seat, there to implore wisdom to direct and strength to do our duty.

It appears to me that the first question we should ascertain from the only rule of faith and practice by the light of the Holy Spirit is, "Is the American Tract Society an Institution of Jesus Christ?" If so, we are bound as Christians, and as a Church, to aid it by our countenance and funds, unconnected as it is with sectarian tenets; we should aid it, whether it refuses to permit our Church to be represented on its publishing committee or not; we should obey our Master's will and aid our Master's cause through evil and through good report; we should place *respect* to his cause and the triumphs of the Cross infinitely paramount to any *respect* which we may feel due to us. If such an institution was established by Christ or his apostles, and if it disseminates the pure doctrines he taught, we are bound by every principle of our holy religion to aid it by our prayers and efforts. If it was not instituted by Christ or his apostles, or if it disseminates unsound doctrines, or makes use of human devices to propagate the truth, we are not required to aid it by our purse or prayers; for by so doing, we build, in the institution of Christianity, hay and stubble, or spread the poison of error, or rely upon an arm of flesh.

I hold that every Institution to propagate the religion of Jesus should be *controlled* by his Church, and that no other is valid. The Charter of a Society to disseminate the Christian religion composed of, or controlled by individuals who are without the pale of the Church, never had and never will have the seal of "Heaven's high Chancery." To it, the promise was never made, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The same institution *in* the Church is of Heaven, *out* of the Church, is of earth. We as a Church have such an institution, at least the germ of one, and those churches and ministers "who have given their funds and countenance to the American Tract Society, *only*" for the sake of having the Presbyterian Church honoured by a representative on its publishing committee, may freely apply to our Board of Publication, and no doubt arrangements will be made to publish tracts to the amount of any contribution which may be made for that object.

Whether the American Tract Society disseminates the pure doctrines

of the Cross unmixed with the errors of the day, I am unable to say; but I do know that to aid the spread of the gospel, it has resorted to human devices.

I hold that falsehood in any form, or to effect any purpose, connected with the spread of the gospel never was and never will be countenanced by the Great Head of the Church. I allude to the many fictitious narratives issued by that Society; the *object* of such publications is laudable, but the *means* are unworthy a follower of the God of Truth. Let the Church sanction the principle "to do evil that good may come," and the foundations of Christianity would be up-torn, the truth of God would be turned to falsehood. We would look with contempt on the minister of the Cross who in private conversation or in the pulpit, would detail to us as truth, a fictitious narrative of events in which he represented himself as an actor, with day and place, persons and conversation. Why then should we respect the *printed* falsehood, love the effort, and feel hurt and degraded that we cannot aid in its circulation? If such means are justifiable for the promulgation of the gospel, then they should be proclaimed by the pulpit, and practised by the Church; the numerous works of fiction intended for the promulgation of morality should be introduced into the library of every Christian—the theatre abstracted of its pollutions and fashioned into a school of morality, should become the resort of our youth; and a protestant endorsement should be given to popish miracles.

But it may be said that "these narratives are known to be fictitious and are not published as facts." But they *are* published as facts; and thousands believe them to be a veritable detail of events. But suppose they were proclaimed as fictitious on their title page. Did Christ ever authorize his ministers or people to promulgate his word on any other foundation than the cross? Would not the same authority authorize his ministers to use the same means in the pulpit? Is it not, in fine, a part of that system of human machinery which gets up revivals at any time, manufactures revival ministers, and is the fruitful source of all the causes with which fanaticism and error are blighting the fair heritage of God's people?

I have written thus with no unfriendly feeling to the American Tract Society. I do not know, whether it has or has not recently published any works of this character. I write for the truth as it is in Christ Jesus—I am opposed to any human devices to promulgate or sustain that truth. I would see our beloved Church go forth to battle in the army of the Lord of Hosts, clothed only in the whole armour of God, and wielding no other weapon than the sword of the Spirit.—*Forks of the Delaware.*—*Presbyterian.*

Church of Scotland.

The Edinburgh Observer mentions a "grand demonstration" in favour of the suspended ministers of Strathbogie. "On Sabbath last, Principal McFarlan officiated for Mr. Walker at Huntly, Principal Haldane at Keith, Dr. Cooke at Rhynie, Dr. Hill at Morilach, Mr. Brewster, of Levan, at Glass, Mr. Ritchie, of St. Boswell's at Marnoch, Mr. Colville, of Leith, at Botriphnie, and Mr. Liston, of Redgorton, at Cairnie." Another action, presenting rather a new feature in the Church question, has been raised and executed, at the instance of Mr. Thomas Clark, presentee to the church and united parishes of Lethendy and Kinloch, against the majority of the Presbytery at Dunkeld. It will be recollected that, on the 30th March last the Presbytery of Dunkeld, by a majority of 15 to 3, refused to take Mr. Clark on trials. The three forming the minority were the Rev. Henry Henderson, of Kincaven, the

Rev. Thomas Nelson, of Auchtergaven, ministers, and Robert Menzies, banker, Dunkeld elder; who gave in a paper stating that they were willing and ready to take Mr. Clarke on trials, and if found qualified, to admit and receive him minister of the church and parishes of Lethendy and Kinloch, according to law. The present action has been brought to have it found and declared that the minority are competent to constitute and hold meetings of Presbytery for the purpose of taking Mr. Clark on trials, and if, in their judgment, he be found qualified, to admit and receive him as a minister of the said church and united parishes; and also for interdict against the majority of the Presbytery obstructing, molesting, or hindering in any way the minority in performing what is styled their statutory duty.—*Dundee Warder*.

Auchterarder Case.—The Perth Courier states that the Presbytery of Auchterarder have all and severally been summoned in this case. In the summons the minority who formerly moved that the presentee be taken on trials, are now ordered to go on with his trials with a view to his ordination. The majority in their summons prohibited from giving the minority any molestation or obstruction in their duty, under the penalty of 1000*l.* each. The presbytery took no step in the matter when they met on Wednesday.

The following is Lord John Russell's letter in reply to the queries submitted by the friends of the dominant party of the Church of Scotland in London:—

Wilton Crescent, June 26, 1841.

Sir—In answer to the circular you have sent to me, I beg to state, in the first place, that I am not ready to pledge myself to any particular course of conduct, by which I might be precluded from agreeing to some plan calculated to establish harmony in the Church of Scotland. I informed Lord Aberdeen last year, that if his bill came into the House of Commons, I should oppose it. I must still do so, unless it is greatly altered. I am not prepared to assent to the Duke of Argyle's Bill, without modification. I am anxious to preserve to the Church of Scotland both those members who have conceived themselves bound to enforce the Veto Act by the deposition of those who did not obey it, and also those ministers who have acted on their conviction of duty, in obedience to the law as laid down in the civil tribunals. I conceive this object is still attainable, and it will not be till all hope of conciliation is at an end, that I shall determine upon the ultimate course to be pursued. To such a Bill as you mention in your first and second resolutions, properly guarded, and which shall secure on the one hand the opinion of a deliberative majority of male communicants, and which shall, on the other, provide, not for the mere assent, but the conscientious examination of the rejection by the Church Courts, I shall willingly give my concurrence.

Allow me to say, farther, that a spirit of conciliation and charity can alone give efficacy to any law or written agreement upon the subject. I have the honour to be, your most obedient servant.—*J. Russell*.

Affairs of the Church of Scotland.

Mr. Dunlop moved that the overture regarding the election of elders be transmitted to Presbyteries, and a debate on this most important matter took place. When the house met in the evening and resumed the discussion, an event occurred which has not happened in the history of this church for 250 years. This was the intimation that a Messenger-at-arms was at the door for the purpose of serving

the interdict granted by the Court of Session, prohibiting the General Assembly to take any farther steps for carrying into effect the deposition of the Strathbogie ministers. Application for this interdict had been made by the seven ministers, and the Lord Ordinary had granted it in the mean time, ordering answers to be given in. A very animated discussion arose out of this, which will be found in our report of the Assembly's proceedings, and the whole has issued in the adoption of the following resolutions, which were moved by Mr. Candlish, when the Assembly met yesterday, and which were carried by a majority of above two to one, without any discussion, which, to those who saw the confusion of Saturday evening, was a cause of great joy, surprise, and thankfulness. The resolutions contain a distinct narrative of what took place on the occasion.

The General Assembly, considering the serious nature of the interruption which occurred during their last sederunt, deem it proper to adopt the following resolutions respecting it:—

1. That, on the afternoon of Saturday 29th May, the General Assembly while engaged in the despatch of business deliberating on a subject most deeply involving the interests of this Church and of the people of Scotland, did receive intimation, by a letter addressed to their Moderator, that a messenger-at-arms was in attendance, for the purpose of serving on the Assembly, through their Moderator and other office-bearers, during the sitting of the Court, copies of an interdict alleged to have been granted by the Lords of Council and Session against this Assembly carrying into execution a sentence pronounced by them, in the exercise of discipline, upon certain ministers of this Church.

2. That his Grace the Lord High Commissioner, not having then returned to the Assembly after the adjournment of the forenoon diet, and the Assembly judging it to be due to his Grace, as her Majesty's representative, to afford him an opportunity of being present, while a matter so important was before the House, which might affect both the liberties of the Assembly and the dignity of the Sovereign under whose immediate cognizance and sanction this Assembly is convened,—a deputation was appointed to wait upon his Grace, and to intimate to him what had occurred. And, that, in the mean time, the party said to be in attendance was informed, by a letter from the Clerk, that the communication above mentioned had been received, and was under the consideration of the Assembly.

3. That the Commissioner having most courteously received the deputation of the Assembly, and signified his intention of attending without delay at the sitting of the Assembly, did accordingly, after a brief interval, resume his place on the Throne;—that, in the mean while, the party, said to be in attendance, had intimated to the Moderator, in a second letter, that he had withdrawn from the House, and that the copies of the interdict, above referred to, had been left by the messenger-at-arms with one of the door-keepers of the House;—that the Moderator accordingly, on the arrival of the Commissioner, did, by the instructions of the Assembly, address his Grace, intimating this new circumstance, and conveying to his Grace the cordial thanks of the Assembly for his kindness on the occasion, and that his Grace made a most gracious reply, assuring the Assembly of his readiness to maintain the rights of the Church and the prerogatives of the Crown, from whatever quarter they might be assailed.

4. That the attempt thus made, in so extraordinary a manner, to serve upon the Assembly an alleged interdict of a Civil Court, said to be granted against a spiritual sentence of the Assembly—an attempt only once before made in the history of this Church, at a period prior to the final securing of the jurisdiction and liberties of the Church by the act of 1592, and even then resisted, and ultimately abandoned—did occasion very considerable embarrassment and confusion, and did most seriously interrupt and impede the momentous business which the Assembly had on hand, from which interruption the Assembly sustained very great inconvenience and injury.

5. That the papers thus left at the door of the Assembly are said, in the communications previously mentioned, to be copies of an interdict alleged to have been granted by the Court of Session, and intended to be served on this Assembly touching a sentence of deposition pronounced by this Assembly, in the exercise of the discipline of the Church, on certain ministers who have been found guilty of heinous spiritual offences; that any such attempt, on the part of any Civil Court, or any Civil Judge in this realm, to interfere with the procedure of this general Assembly, is a flagrant violation of the privileges of this National Church, as ratified by the constitution and laws of the United Kingdom, which expressly secure to this Church, and to the supreme Assembly thereof, exclusive jurisdiction in all spiritual matters, and especially in the deposition of ministers, and in whatsoever affects the discipline and government of the Church; that this Assembly, meeting with the concurrence and by the authority of her Most Gracious Majesty, and in the presence of her Majesty, as represented by her Commissioner, is as truly a supreme and independent Court as any other tribunal in the land; that while the Assembly fully recognise the exclusive right of the Civil Courts to determine all civil questions that may arise out of their judgment, without any control or interference on the part of this Assembly, the spiritual sentence of the Assembly in this case is, and ought to be, considered final; and that any obstruction offered to the intimation and execution of the same, is an infringement on the spiritual authority which the church holds directly and immediately from the Lord Jesus, and from Him alone, as her great and only Head, and is, moreover, an invasion of her constitutional rights and liberties as the Established Church of this land.

6. That in circumstances so peculiar and so critical, this Assembly is solemnly called to protest against this violent intrusion of the secular arm into the ecclesiastical province, and to represent this most alarming state of matters to the rulers and legislators of this great nation, on whom must rest the responsibility of upholding the Established Church in the full possession of all her scriptural and constitutional privileges; that, with this view, these resolutions ought to be transmitted to her Majesty the Queen in council, and that the General Assembly resolve accordingly.—*Edinburgh Witness*.

Ecclesiastical Record.

At a meeting of the Presbytery of Chartiers, held on the 6th of July, Messrs. James Logue and John Todd were licensed to preach the everlasting gospel, and are now actively employed in communicating the word of life to our vacancies.

At a recent meeting of the Presbytery of Muskingum, Mr. James Doig was licensed to preach the Gospel.

Report of the Treasurer of the Education Fund.

The following Report was made to Synod at the recent meeting, and should have appeared in the minutes; but by some oversight, was not received by us at that time.

Report of the Treasurer of the Education Fund of the Associate Synod.

T. BEVERIDGE,		DR.
May, 1840—Associate Congregation of Albany,	- - - -	\$ 49 75
" " " " " " " " " " " "	- - - -	6 00
Feb. 22, 1841—Mr. William Morris, Baltimore,	- - - -	100 00
" 23, " " " " " " " " " " " "	- - - -	50 00
March, 1841—Associate Congregation of Mount Hope,	- - - -	8 50
" " " " " " " " " " " "	- - - -	7 30
May, 1841—" " " " " " " " " " " "	- - - -	4 00
		<hr/>
		\$225 55
		CR.
Feb. 23, 1841—To a student by direction of the donor,	- - - -	\$ 30 00
Mar. 17, " " " " " " " " " " " "	- - - -	75 00
" " " " " " " " " " " "	- - - -	100 00
May 29, " " " " " " " " " " " "	- - - -	20 55
		<hr/>
		\$225 55

THOMAS BEVERIDGE, Treasurer.

The Prospects of the Church. (From the Dundee Warder.)

In the mean time, we have just farther to state, that the prospects of the Church are not without symptoms of brightening. So long as she had not decided on the course which she was to follow, all was darkness and uncertainty around her; but no sooner does she determine on following the path of duty, at whatever hazard, than the darkness, in a remarkable manner, begins to dispel. It is now understood that Lord Belhaven had special instructions to protect the Church in the exercise of her jurisdiction, and in her freedom of discussion, should any serious attempt have been made to interrupt either; and this is countenanced by the fact that, on Thursday, contrary to his usual practice, and for the only time during the sitting of this Assembly, he returned to the evening sederunt, and remained until the close of the proceedings, at about three o'clock A. M., and witnessed the deposition of the "seven." The court of Session have also refused to interfere in the case of Cambusnethan, when applied to for an interdict against the farther proceedings of the Assembly, on the ground of the presence of the ministers and elders of *quoad sacra* parishes. It is also confidently stated, that the reason why Dr. Cook and his party quietly *acquiesced* in a motion *refusing to receive* the insolent declaration and protest which they laid upon the table after the finding in the case of the "seven" is, that a letter had been received from Sir Robert Peel, recommending submission to their ecclesiastical superiors. This is very probable. We before stated that, when about to enter upon the great struggle which now agitates the country, Sir Robert Peel and his party would not venture to do any thing which might seriously embroil them with the Church, because they could not afford it. And it has always been a part of moderate policy to be moved with the breath of statesmen and nobles, and to lean upon them rather than upon the people for support. A hint to them from such a quarter would at once have its weight, and would prove far more effectual than ten thousand arguments.

g,
nt,

R.
75
00
00

00
50
30
00

55

R.
00

00
00
55

55

ets
ong
all
she
man
ow
the
dis-
upt
ary
his
ntil
vit-
ave
ied
oly,
oad
why
re-
the
tter
ion
ore
ow
en-
the
een
men
for
ave
and

CONTENTS.

	Page		Page
A Father's Advice to his Children,	145	Remarks on the Article of Farnside-	
Infidelity in England,	150	mos,	175
Associate Reformed Synod of New-		Fermented Wine,	177
York,	151	Reformed Presbyterian Synod in	
Unjust Deposition,	153	Scotland,	185
Ecclesiastical Affairs of Scotland,	154	American Tract Society,	186
Cheever's Letters from Spain,	155	Church of Scotland,	188
The Cause of God and Truth,	157	Anchterarder Case,	189
Extensive Reformation and Revival		Lord John Russell's Letter,	189
in the Church, preceded by Trial		Affairs of the Church of Scotland,	189
and Suffering,	160	Ecclesiastical Record,	191
Jesus is precious,	174	Report of the Treasurer of the Edu-	
Decision respecting a Witness,	174	cation Fund,	199
Perfectionists,	174	The Prospects of the Church,	199

RECEIPTS BY MAIL, from July 1st, to August 20th.

Rev. John Russell,	\$13 00
Rev. Dr. Beveridge, for J. McNary and S. Edgar,	4 00
Robert George,	6 00
Rev. J. McKee per Postmaster,	5 00
James Hutcheson, Esq.,	12 00
Rev. J. McAuley,	5 00

AGENTS.—In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of good standing in the Associate Church, who are requested to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as special agents:

J. B. Weldin, 37 Market Street, Pitts-	Thomas Cummings, Putnam, Washing-
burgh, Pa.	ton Co., N. Y.
James Henry, Albany, N. Y.	James Wilson, Esq., Forks of Muddy
Peter M'Arthur, Cambridge, Washing-	Creek, York Co., Pa.
ton County, N. Y.	Alexander W. Brewster, Erie, Pa.
Alex. Gailey, Clark's Ferry, Perry Co. Pa.	James Hutchinson, Esq., New London
Wm. M'Minn, Potter's Mills, Centre	Cross Roads, Chester Co., Pa.
Co., Pa.	John Smith, Pittsburgh Village, Carroll
Thomas Beveridge, D. D., Canonsburgh,	Co., Indiana.
Pa.	R. G. Shannon, P. M., Columbus, Ran-
James Gordon, Peoria, Livingston Co.,	dolph Co., Ill.
N. Y.	Col. Wm. M'Vey, Cherry Forks, Adams
John Anderson, Huntingdon, Pa.	Co., Ohio.

TERMS.—Two Dollars per annum, payable in advance or at the annual meeting of the Associate Synod.

Print Masters are respectfully requested to notify us of any discontinuance of the work sent to their office. The numbers need not be returned.

No subscription discontinued till arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the proprietors.

Money may be sent by mail at the risk and expense of the proprietors when five dollars or more is enclosed, provided the money is at par value in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York, or Albany.

David Christy, the General Agent of the *Calvinistic Book Concern*, expects to visit the congregations of the Associate Church, in connexion with the other denominations interested, to make arrangements for the supply of the publications of the Board, and has also proposed to aid in extending the circulation of the *Monitor*. He is an authorized agent for the *Monitor*, and his visit will afford the opportunity to many of furnishing themselves with our periodical.

PROPOSALS for publishing the first part of Dr. Gill's Reply to Whithy, which is perfect in itself and was originally published in a separate volume: together with an Introductory Essay, explanatory of the *Gospel Offer*, by C. WHEEVER. Although Dr. Gill's Refutation of Arminianism is entirely satisfactory, yet his views of the *Gospel Offer* are very obscure: to correct this defect in the work is the design of the Introductory Essay. Only five hundred copies will be printed. Persons sending in their orders in season can have the work delivered to them at Albany, Pittsburgh, and Xenia, Ohio, on or before the next meeting of Synod. The work, neatly bound in marbled paper can be supplied at fifty cents a copy, or twelve copies for \$5 00, to be sent to Subscribers in such manner as they may direct; or, in pamphlet form with stiff covers, at thirty-seven and a-half cents a copy, or seventeen copies for \$5 00.